



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 107th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 147

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, APRIL 3, 2001

No. 47

House of Representatives

The House met at 12:30 p.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. ADERHOLT).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
April 3, 2001.

I hereby appoint the Honorable ROBERT B. ADERHOLT to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

J. DENNIS HASTERT,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING HOUR DEBATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 3, 2001, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning hour debates. The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to not to exceed 30 minutes, and each Member, except the majority leader, the minority leader, or the minority whip, limited to not to exceed 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) for 5 minutes.

UNEXPLODED ORDNANCES ARE SERIOUS PROBLEM

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I have just returned from the campus of American University in the exclusive Spring Valley residential community here in Washington, D.C.

From a distance one could not imagine, but it is actually one of over a thousand sites around the country where war is being continued; 26 years after the Vietnam War, 56 years after the conclusion of World War II, 83 years after World War I, there is still a

battle taking place right here on American soil. It involves mines, nerve gases, and toxics and explosive shells. It has claimed at least 65 lives, and has maimed and injured many more. Sadly, it continues every day, and if we are not careful, it will continue for another thousand years.

Toxic explosive waste of our military activities in the United States, unexploded ordnances on formerly used defense installations probably contaminates 20 to 25 million acres in the United States, and the number could be as high as 50 million acres. Sadly, no one can give us an accurate appraisal of the problem. What we do know is at the current rate of spending, it will take centuries, maybe even a thousand years or more, to return this land to safe and productive use. Some may be so damaged, we may not attempt to clean it up.

Unexploded ordnances are a serious problem today. Human activity and wildlife are encroaching on more and more of these sites as our neighborhoods grow and sprawl. At the same time, the natural rhythms of nature, flooding, earthquakes, and landslides, aided and abetted by human activity, exposes these dangers. Today, across America, we are finding lost and forgotten unexploded ordnance that was intentionally buried in a feeble attempt to dispose of it, or a shell that missed its mark and did not explode as intended.

There are many targets toward which citizens can direct their frustrations and in some cases anger: the Department of Defense, the Army Corps of Engineers or EPA. People have some legitimate concerns about what these and other agencies have done in the past and what they are doing now. But there is one participant that is missing in action, and that is the United States Congress. Only we in Congress can set adequate funding levels, budget clearly, and then make sure that enough

money is appropriated to do the job right. Congress can pinpoint managerial responsibility and establish the rules of the game.

It is not acceptable to me for Congress to occasionally step in from the sidelines, complain, protest, and then shift inadequate funding from one high-priority project to another high-priority project. This ability to find an unexploded ordnance, decontaminate sites and have the infrastructure is going to be a zero-sum game if we do not properly advance the goal of protection.

Mr. Speaker, Congress needs to report for duty, and needs to provide the administrative and financial tools that are necessary. What I am talking about will not affect active ranges and readiness. That is a separate topic with its own set of issues. My concern is the closed, transferred and transferring ranges where the public is exposed or soon will be.

More than 1,000 years to clean up these sites is not an appropriate timetable when people are at risk every day. In the 1980s, three boys in San Diego were playing in a field next to a subdivision that they lived in, and they found a shell. It exploded and killed two of them. American University campus that I just left has a child care center that is now closed down because of high levels of arsenic contamination because this area during World War I was a test ground for poison and chemical warfare.

Mr. Speaker, we must make sure that whether it is in suburban Washington, D.C., on Martha's Vineyard or in Camp Bonneville in my community that we get the job done, and it is not appropriate to take a millennium or even a century to do it. We need to step up and do the job.

Mr. Speaker, my goal in Congress is to make sure that every Member understands what is going on in their State because there are these toxic

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H1353

waste dumps, chemical and weapons disposal in every State. We can make sure that somebody is in charge, that there is enough funding, and we get the job done so that no child will be at risk for death, dismemberment or serious illness as a result of the United States Government not cleaning up after itself.

CHINA: FRIEND OR FOE?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, in the last Congress and many before, many of us have heard predictions that have been made regarding China. Advocates last year stated that granting permanent normal trade relations to China would help bring reform to this Communist government, and establish a real friendship between our nations.

Reading the papers last year and this year, this week particularly, I see nothing to support that statement. I think relationships are pretty shaky as they are.

On February 11 of this year, Chinese officials detained an American family. In doing so, they separated the couple's 5-year-old son from his parents for 26 days. After 26 days, little Andrew was reunited with his father and expelled; but his mother is still being held.

President Bush is demanding the release of this Washington-based sociologist. Her family claims that the alleged spying charges are trumped up. The State Department has announced this woman was not even an agent of the American intelligence service.

Now China has detained a second American scholar. This hardly seems like a nation that is becoming cooperative after receiving permanent normal trade relations with the United States. China's already poor human rights record sadly worsened last year. I am pleased that the new administration has recognized that fact and has urged the United Nations to address the widespread oppression in China. The United States U.N. Ambassador stated that the U.S. "should not be silent when those who call for democratic government or more cultural preservation and religious freedom in Tibet and elsewhere in China are suppressed or when advocates of labor rights are thrown in jail." But sadly, this may never take place.

Mr. Speaker, every year since the 1989 killing of student protestors in and around Tiananmen Square, China's delegation has introduced a "no-action motion," therefore successfully stopping all attempts to examine its human rights record. It would seem naive to ask why.

All of this would seem troublesome enough, but now we face even larger concerns. On Sunday of this week, a U.S. Navy plane and a Chinese fighter jet collided over the South China Sea

causing the American craft to make an emergency landing in China and the Chinese plane to crash. Officials from China are claiming that the bulkier, clumsier American plane that is roughly the size of a Boeing 737 rammed the light, agile Chinese fighter jet. This would again seem to contradict our view of common sense. Many U.S. experts agree that the incident was most likely caused by an accident on the part of the Chinese.

Sensitivity to the situation will ultimately result from the Chinese handling of the American EP-3 and its crew of 24. It is a reconnaissance aircraft, so it would seem likely that the Chinese military experts would want to board the aircraft to assess what is there, and I understand this morning that diplomats are meeting with the crew.

U.S. officials state that the Chinese generally intercept one out of every three U.S. patrol flights. Recently, concern has been raised with the Chinese Government regarding the fact that Chinese pilots have "become more aggressive." Now, according to Admiral Dennis Blair, Chief of the U.S. Pacific Command, the U.S. has protested the "pattern of increasingly unsafe behavior," but "did not get a satisfactory response." It is presumed that all 24 crew members are safe, but there is yet to be a direct contact between the crew and American officials. American officials are there and are hoping to get in to talk to the crew.

Navy officials also claim that last week a confrontation occurred between a Chinese warship and a Navy surveillance ship in international waters. The officials describe the incident as threatening.

Other examples showing cracks within our forged relationship with China also bear noting, such as China's involvement with Pakistan's nuclear bomb program and their recent questionable involvement in Iraq, to name just a few.

Mr. Speaker, it is clear that our relationship with China needs to be carefully reevaluated. Since PNTR, we have seen aggressive behavior on their part. Our prayers are with the 24 crew members, and I am hopeful that a speedy resolution will occur. I look to the Bush administration to move forward appropriately with China.

CONGRESS NEEDS TO FUND PROGRAMS TO HELP AT-RISK JUVENILES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I have a long list here, and I am not going to read all of it, but we could start in 1994, Union, Kentucky.

1995, Redlands, California; Richmond, Virginia.

1997, Bethel, Alaska; Pearl, Mississippi.

1998, Jonesboro, Arkansas; Edinboro, Pennsylvania; Fayetteville, Tennessee; and Springfield, Oregon, my hometown. 1999, Deming, New Mexico.

2001, Santee, California; Williamsport, Pennsylvania; and El Cajon, California, all in 1 month.

This is, unfortunately, only a partial list of school shootings in the United States over the last decade.

Mr. Speaker, we have got to ask what has been the coordinated and thoughtful response of our policymakers here in Washington, D.C., and I think we would find it lacking. Now, there is certainly no easy answer. There is no one-size-fits-all solution to these problems. But, Mr. Speaker, there are proven programs that are underfunded that could be better funded that might help prevent future tragedies, that might get to one disturbed youth, one at-risk family, that might bring forward some other students before the fact, and we should be doing all we can to encourage and fund those programs.

Mr. Speaker, we often expect that somebody somewhere is going to take care of the violence, is going to make things better, but really who is the somebody here? We all have to take some responsibility, every one of us. In my own hometown of Springfield, there was an incredible community response and a response from other communities, and statewide, and people from other States who came to help us, and even some help from the Federal Government in working through the immediate aftermath. But I fear some of that urgency is gone now, as the violence has gone elsewhere, and now those communities are in a crisis.

Mr. Speaker, we need a more coordinated approach. I am reintroducing legislation today that has a number of parts. It is not comprehensive, but it is a good start at helping to address these problems.

First and foremost, increased funding for Head Start and other early intervention prevention programs, a program for Federal funding for community programs, like the Birth to 3 in my State that intervenes with young, at-risk women and helps them before they become a problem or get into a situation that is a problem with their children. More money for child abuse programs that focus on community-based family preservation and crisis intervention, a funding increase for the Juvenile Justice Delinquency Prevention programs, including court schools.

I visited court schools. It is a tremendous program. We take a kid today who threatens violence or has been expelled from school, and what do we do? There they are, they are out on the street for the most part. Those kids need a more structured environment. For many of them, it does not even seem like punishment to be thrown out of school. They should be removed and placed in a court school, which is a more rigid environment, which brings

in community resources and counseling resources to help them deal with their problems in the hope that we can get them back into the public school environment, and that they can become productive citizens. Do not just send them down to the mall or out in the streets with an expulsion order. Court schools work, and we need some more Federal assistance for those programs.

The National Guard has a very, very successful program, the Youth Challenge Program. It is underfunded. There is a long waiting list of States that want to have programs. We have one in Oregon that has been inadequately funded. The rate of recidivism of the kids that get in that program is minuscule. It works. It is not for every kid. That is not the solution for every kid, but it is a part of the puzzle, and it works, and why not put more money there. We can afford that. If we can afford to give tax breaks to billionaires, we can afford a few more dollars for the National Guard Youth Challenge program, assistance to schools and local police departments to combat juvenile crime, including funds for placing police officers in schools.

Mr. Speaker, let us help the communities who want to engage in prevention and intervention. We can institute a 72-hour hold, a mandate for a 72-hour hold for juveniles caught with a firearm on school grounds. The list goes on and on. These are simple things. They are things we could be doing, I say to my colleagues.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support my wide-reaching package as a beginning of an indication that the Federal Government cares and will work in partnership with communities and concerned citizens and parents and kids to resolve this problem.

COMMENDING THE UNIVERSITY OF NOTRE DAME WOMEN'S BASKETBALL TEAM FOR WINNING THE 2001 NCAA WOMEN'S BASKETBALL CHAMPIONSHIP

THE SPEAKER *pro tempore* (Mr. ADERHOLT). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Speaker, the famous sports writer Grantland Rice once wrote these words: "Outlined against a blue-gray October sky, the four horsemen rode again. In dramatic lore they are known as famine, pestilence, destruction and death."

These famous words name the four horsemen with the University of Notre Dame football team. With the women's national championship win, with the Notre Dame basketball program Sunday night, we have at least four new names in Irish legend and in "Hoosier Hysteria." They are Ratay and Ivey, Riley and Siemon, players that fought with tenacity and heart to come back from a 16-point deficit against the defending champs, the University of Con-

necticut, in a semifinal game and win by 15 points. They are the team that came back from 12 points down in the national championship game against the respected intrastate rivals, the Purdue Boilermakers with all-American Katie Douglas, and won the national championship by 2 points Sunday night.

I have to say to my colleagues in the House of Representatives, this was a flat-out exciting game that was one of the best national championships fought between men or women's games in the history of national basketball tournaments. This was a game that was exciting to watch in person or in one's living rooms for men and women and boys and girls across the country, to see Ruth Riley, the all-American star for the University of Notre Dame, score 28 points, rip down 13 rebounds and block 7 shots, all-American standards by any definition.

When we talk about high-caliber standards, nobody sets them better than the coach, Muffet McGraw, who has been at the helm of the University of Notre Dame for 14 years. This past year, she won three coach of the year awards, the Naismith Award, the Associated Press Award, and the WBCA National Coach of the Year Award, for her stellar coaching performance, in a 34 wins and 2 losses season. She did not do it by herself. Coach Owens, Coach McGruff, Coach Washington all helped her and these great teammates to win the national championship.

They had a lot of talent on this stellar team, not just the four names that I mentioned that go down in Irish lore, but the entire team dedicated to high academic standards and playing their hearts out on the floor.

Mr. Speaker, I want to conclude by recognizing their outstanding season. I was privileged enough to attend their very first practice on October 15 and talk to the team and try to encourage them on to have a successful season. Those are high standards that we live up to in Indiana, where we have the legend of Larry Bird, where we have high school gyms that see 10,000 and 12,000 people for great games at the high-school level, and where tiny, small, little Milan High School won the State championship in 1954, creating the legendary Hoosiers movie. We now have the University of Notre Dame Fighting Irish 2001 national champions to enter into the lore, the legend, and the "Hoosier Hysteria." Congratulations. We are proud of you. Congratulations to the continuing ascendancy of women's basketball in America.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the University of Notre Dame Women's Basketball Team. The Fighting Irish claimed the 2001 NCAA Women's Basketball National Championship on April 1 in St. Louis, Missouri against intrastate rival, the Purdue University Boilermakers, in a classic Hoosier contest that will be long remembered as one of the best championship games in history.

By winning the national championship on Sunday, the Fighting Irish provided a fitting

end to an extraordinary season. Their record was an outstanding thirty-four wins and only two defeats. This team embodied the true spirit of college athletics and the two hard fought games in the Final Four serve as a testament to their heart. In the semifinal game against the defending national champion and Big East Conference rival, University of Connecticut, the Irish staged a remarkable come from behind victory thanks to the dominant play of Naismith National Player of the Year, Ruth Riley, and the Frances Pomeroy Naismith Award winner, Niele Ivey. As the second half commenced, the Irish trailed the Connecticut Huskies by as many as sixteen points. The Irish refused to quit, however. Riley, Ivey, sharp shooter Alicia Ratay and the rest of the Irish scored on 15 of their next 20 possessions. Thanks to a 14-0 run, the Irish avenged a heart-breaking loss to the Huskies in the Big East Conference Tournament Final and ended up with a triumphant 90-75 victory. The comeback was the biggest in NCAA Final Four history. The Irish also made eight of their 11 three-point attempts, a national semifinal record.

The Irish saved more heroics for the National Championship game against intrastate rival Purdue. Trailing by as many as twelve points, the Irish responded with grit and determination. Notre Dame relied on balanced scoring. Junior Ericka Haney contributed thirteen points, Ivey had twelve points, and senior Kelley Siemon tallied ten points. Ratay tied the game at 62 with a three point shot four minutes to play in the game. But it was Riley who provided the heroics fitting of a champion. Riley erased Purdue's final lead of the game with a layup off a pass from Ratay. The game was tied at 66 with less than one minute to play. With 5.8 seconds to play, Riley was fouled and headed to the foul line with the national championship literally on the line. Riley made both free throws to seal the victory and the championship for the Fighting Irish. Riley finished the game with 28 points, 13 rebounds, and 7 blocked shots and was awarded the distinction of Most Outstanding Player.

In Muffet McGraw's fourteen years as head coach of the Women's Basketball team at Notre Dame, fans have grown accustomed to watching the Irish win with class. Coach McGraw has elevated the program to the pinnacle of college basketball while demanding academic excellence and exemplary sportsmanship from her players. McGraw's savvy coaching skills and dedication to playing with class are shining examples of why she was honored with three National Coach of the Year awards (Naismith, Associated Press, and the WBCA National Coach of the Year) this season. In winning her first national championship and reaching her second Final Four, Coach McGraw has proven that you can win with class and with the highest of academic standards. Coach McGraw's assistant coaches, Carol Owens, Kevin McGuff, and Coquese Washington (Notre Dame '92) must also be honored for their dedication to the team and to Notre Dame.

Coach McGraw's expectation to win with class was put into practice by this year's seniors. The strong character and the fierce determination of Riley, Ivey, Kelley Siemon, Meaghan Leahy, and Imani Dunbar set the tone for this season. They were able to end their illustrious collegiate careers with a victory and a championship.

Ruth Riley excelled as a student-athlete. She became Notre Dame's first player to win the Naismith Women's College Player of the Year and she was a unanimous Associated Press first team All-American. Riley became the first person in Big East Conference history to sweep all three of the major awards: Big East Player of the Year, Big East Defensive Player of the Year, and the Big East Scholar Athlete of the Year. The Macy, Indiana native has certainly found a place in Indiana's rich basketball lore, known as "Hoosier Hysteria."

Niele Ivey was considered the heart and soul of the team. In her determination to lead the Irish to the Final Four in her hometown of St. Louis, Missouri, Ivey provided valuable focus during the Midwest Regional games against Alcorn State, Michigan, Utah, and Vanderbilt. A consummate champion, Ivey earned Associated Press All-American honors. She was also the recipient of the Frances Pomeroy Naismith Award presented to the nation's outstanding female collegian 5-foot-8 and under who excelled athletically and academically.

Kelley Siemon teamed with Riley to make a formidable front court. Siemon won the Big East Most Improved Player award and she was also voted to the honorable mention all-Big East team.

Junior Ericka Haney served as valuable and versatile starter for the Irish. Haney helped spark the Irish comeback against Connecticut in the semifinal game. Sophomore Alicia Ratay proved to be one of the nation's top perimeter shooters and she was a candidate for All-American honors. Ratay led the nation in three point shooting percentage and was honored with a third-team all-Big East distinction.

Sophomore reserve players, Amanda Barksdale, Monique Hernandez, and Karen Swanson, and freshmen Jeneka Joyce and Le'Tania Severe provided valuable minutes throughout the season. With such young talent, the Irish basketball program has a promising future.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, the 2001 Notre Dame Women's Basketball Team deserves to be recognized for their Championship caliber play, their tenacity and their exemplary sportsmanship. I am proud and deeply honored to recognize this magnificent achievement. Go Irish!

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12 of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until 2 p.m.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 54 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until 2 p.m.

□ 1400

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mrs. EMERSON) at 2 p.m.

PRAYER

The Reverend Dr. Ronald F. Christian, Lutheran Social Services, Fairfax, Virginia, offered the following prayer:

God of all mercy and grace, look kindly upon all Your people this day in

both the celebrations and the sufferings of life. Shield the joyous from pride and relieve the grieving of their sorrow.

Where health of body and mind is in jeopardy, grant a full measure of Your healing and hope. Where conflict and distrust between people are present, provide a quiet and calm refrain in the clamor of their strife. And where hunger and thirst are Your children's basic needs, challenge all those with an abundance of this world's possessions the desire to be good stewards and to share with others from their own storehouses of wealth.

Wherever hate outranks love, wherever sadness is more common than joy, wherever retaliation is the first acceptable alternative to mercy, then and there, Oh God, we pray, give to all of Your people a sense of what Your justice for our world might mean, and let Your peace ever rule in our lives. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House her approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from Guam (Mr. UNDERWOOD) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. UNDERWOOD led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

IN MEMORY OF JAKE SINIAWSKI

(Mr. CHABOT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CHABOT. Madam Speaker, Jim and Carol Siniaowski lost their little boy last month. Their son Justin lost his brother. I lost a special friend. It was an honor and a privilege to have gotten to know Jake Siniaowski. Jake suffered from a rare blood disorder called Fanconi anemia, which ultimately claimed his life. He was only 10 years old.

While he was quite ill for much of his short life, his obituary in the Cincinnati Post noted that Jake was an inspiration to everyone and lived life to the fullest every day.

The medical community worked hard to provide a cure for Jake. The good people of St. Bernard's Church sponsored a marrow-typing blood drive in an effort to find a compatible bone marrow donor. His family and friends and neighbors always remembered him in their prayers. Those who loved him did all that they could.

I have talked about Jake on this floor in the past, and I know my colleagues in the United States Congress join me in expressing our condolences to Jake's loving family.

Madam Speaker, we can help boys and girls like Jake by participating in the National Marrow Donor Program. All it takes is a simple blood test. It could save a life. God bless you, Jake.

UNITED STATES SHOULD INVESTIGATE JANET RENO AND CONTRIBUTORS TO THE DNC

(Mr. TRAFICANT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TRAFICANT. Madam Speaker, while John Huang and James Riady are partying in Hawaii, 24 Americans are being held against their will in China. Think about it, China is taking \$100 billion a year out of America, buying missiles with our money, pointing them at us, and now they are holding Americans against their will.

What is next, Madam Speaker? Will they return the 24 Americans when they deliver to the Pentagon the black berets they bought for millions and millions of dollars?

Beam me up. Has Uncle Sam become Uncle Sucker here? I yield back the fact that we should investigate the treason, the treason of Janet Reno and those campaign contributions to the Democrat National Committee.

TRIBUTE TO MIKE MARINER

(Mr. FLAKE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FLAKE. Madam Speaker, today I rise to pay tribute to a good friend, Mike Mariner, who passed away last week, and whose funeral service is being held today in Snowflake, Arizona. Each of us will face challenges in life, but few of us will be called to face for a moment what Mike endured for most of a lifetime.

Those who grew up with Mike will remember his good humor, his playful spirit, and fortunately for those of us who often displayed the insensitivity of youth, his boundless ability to forgive and forget.

Those who have kept in touch with Mike over the past several years have been softened, touched, and are inspired by his tireless effort to keep his frail body in step with his keen mind. The world is a better place because Mike lived in it, and we are a better people for having known him.

Mike is now home, and because of the difficult road he has traveled, we can find special meaning in the poet's phrase "He has slipped the surly bonds of Earth and touched the face of God." God bless you, Mike.

SINO-AMERICAN RELATIONS

(Mr. PITTS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PITTS. Madam Speaker, China is holding two dozen American citizens who were forced to make an emergency landing after an air collision that appears to be the fault of the Chinese Air Force. They are not just holding American citizens, they are also holding very sensitive American technology.

Causing this collision and holding the plane and its crew are flagrant violations of international agreements China is party to. What other agreements will they violate? It may be China is saber-rattling to try to keep us from protecting our national interests. Maybe they are trying to keep us from assisting our friends in Taiwan. Perhaps China is testing our new President to see what he is made of.

President Bush should make it clear, we will defend our national interests. We will make sure Taiwan can defend itself; we should sell Taiwan the Aegis cruisers and the Patriot missiles they need to defend themselves.

Madam Speaker, China should not test America. It is in China's interest to return that plane and its crew to us immediately.

ELIMINATING RED TAPE AND OFFERING FULL HEALTH CARE CHOICES FOR MILITARY DEPENDENTS

(Mr. RYUN of Kansas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RYUN of Kansas. Madam Speaker, the dedication of our military spouses is invaluable, and I want to ensure that they are treated right with respect to health care.

Currently, military dependents who use one of the military's choice-related health plans do so believing that they can choose their doctor. But when they become pregnant, they can be forced to change from a civilian provider to an on-base doctor even for delivery.

It is essential that a woman be comfortable with her doctor for this experience. To force a woman to change doctors at a time as critical as pregnancy is unacceptable.

That is why I am introducing legislation to eliminate burdensome red tape and to put women back in charge of their pregnancy-related health care plans.

If we want to continue to attract the high-quality people for our armed services, the people who defend this country and are defending us now, we must make sure they have all the health care provisions they should be entitled to.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair announces that she will postpone further proceedings today on each motion

to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote is objected to under clause 6 of rule XX.

Any record votes on postponed questions will be taken after debate has concluded on all motions to suspend the rules, but not before 6 p.m. today.

CHESAPEAKE BAY OFFICE OF NATIONAL OCEANIC AND ATMOSPHERIC ADMINISTRATION AUTHORIZATION

Mr. GILCHREST. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 642) to reauthorize the Chesapeake Bay Office of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 642

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. CHESAPEAKE BAY OFFICE.

(a) REAUTHORIZATION OF OFFICE.—Section 307 of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration Authorization Act of 1992 (15 U.S.C. 1511d) is amended to read as follows:

“SEC. 307. CHESAPEAKE BAY OFFICE.

“(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—(1) The Secretary of Commerce shall establish, within the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, an office to be known as the Chesapeake Bay Office (in this section referred to as the ‘Office’).

“(2) The Office shall be headed by a Director who shall be appointed by the Secretary of Commerce, in consultation with the Chesapeake Executive Council. Any individual appointed as Director shall have knowledge and experience in research or resource management efforts in the Chesapeake Bay.

“(3) The Director may appoint such additional personnel for the Office as the Director determines necessary to carry out this section.

“(b) FUNCTIONS.—The Office, in consultation with the Chesapeake Executive Council, shall—

“(1) provide technical assistance to the Administrator, to other Federal departments and agencies, and to State and local government agencies in—

“(A) assessing the processes that shape the Chesapeake Bay system and affect its living resources;

“(B) identifying technical and management alternatives for the restoration and protection of living resources and the habitats they depend upon; and

“(C) monitoring the implementation and effectiveness of management plans;

“(2) develop and implement a strategy for the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration that integrates the science, research, monitoring, data collection, regulatory, and management responsibilities of the Secretary of Commerce in such a manner as to assist the cooperative, intergovernmental Chesapeake Bay Program to meet the commitments of the Chesapeake Bay Agreement;

“(3) coordinate the programs and activities of the various organizations within the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, the Chesapeake Bay Regional Sea Grant Programs, and the Chesapeake Bay units of the National Estuarine Research Reserve System, including—

“(A) programs and activities in—

“(i) coastal and estuarine research, monitoring, and assessment;

“(ii) fisheries research and stock assessments;

“(iii) data management;

“(iv) remote sensing;

“(v) coastal management;

“(vi) habitat conservation and restoration; and

“(vii) atmospheric deposition; and

“(B) programs and activities of the Cooperative Oxford Laboratory of the National Ocean Service with respect to—

“(i) nonindigenous species;

“(ii) estuarine and marine species pathology;

“(iii) human pathogens in estuarine and marine environments; and

“(iv) ecosystem health;

“(4) coordinate the activities of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration with the activities of the Environmental Protection Agency and other Federal, State, and local agencies;

“(5) establish an effective mechanism which shall ensure that projects have undergone appropriate peer review and provide other appropriate means to determine that projects have acceptable scientific and technical merit for the purpose of achieving maximum utilization of available funds and resources to benefit the Chesapeake Bay area;

“(6) remain cognizant of ongoing research, monitoring, and management projects and assist in the dissemination of the results and findings of those projects; and

“(7) submit a biennial report to the Congress and the Secretary of Commerce with respect to the activities of the Office and on the progress made in protecting and restoring the living resources and habitat of the Chesapeake Bay, which report shall include an action plan consisting of—

“(A) a list of recommended research, monitoring, and data collection activities necessary to continue implementation of the strategy described in paragraph (2); and

“(B) proposals for—

“(i) continuing any new National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration activities in the Chesapeake Bay; and

“(ii) the integration of those activities with the activities of the partners in the Chesapeake Bay Program to meet the commitments of the Chesapeake 2000 agreement and subsequent agreements.

“(c) CHESAPEAKE BAY FISHERY AND HABITAT RESTORATION SMALL WATERSHED GRANTS PROGRAM.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Director of the Chesapeake Bay Office of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (in this section referred to as the ‘Director’), in cooperation with the Chesapeake Executive Council, shall carry out a community-based fishery and habitat restoration small grants and technical assistance program in the Chesapeake Bay watershed.

“(2) PROJECTS.—

“(A) SUPPORT.—The Director shall make grants under this subsection to pay the Federal share of the cost of projects that are carried out by entities eligible under paragraph (3) for the restoration of fisheries and habitats in the Chesapeake Bay.

“(B) FEDERAL SHARE.—The Federal share under subparagraph (A) shall not exceed 75 percent.

“(C) TYPES OF PROJECTS.—Projects for which grants may be made under this subsection include—

“(i) the improvement of fish passageways;

“(ii) the creation of natural or artificial reefs or substrata for habitats;

“(iii) the restoration of wetland or sea grass;

“(iv) the production of oysters for restoration projects; and

“(v) the prevention, identification, and control of nonindigenous species.

“(3) ELIGIBLE ENTITIES.—The following entities are eligible to receive grants under this subsection:

“(A) The government of a political subdivision of a State in the Chesapeake Bay watershed, and the government of the District of Columbia.

“(B) An organization in the Chesapeake Bay watershed (such as an educational institution or a community organization)—

“(i) that is described in section 501(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 and is exempt

from taxation under section 501(a) of that Code; and

“(ii) that will administer such grants in coordination with a government referred to in subparagraph (A).

“(4) **ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS.**—The Director may prescribe any additional requirements, including procedures, that the Director considers necessary to carry out the program under this subsection.

“(d) **BUDGET LINE ITEM.**—The Secretary of Commerce shall identify, in the President's annual budget to the Congress, the funding request for the Office.

“(e) **CHESAPEAKE EXECUTIVE COUNCIL.**—For purposes of this section, ‘Chesapeake Executive Council’ means the representatives from the Commonwealth of Virginia, the State of Maryland, the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, the Environmental Protection Agency, the District of Columbia, and the Chesapeake Bay Commission, who are signatories to the Chesapeake Bay Agreement, and any future signatories to that Agreement.

“(f) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—There is authorized to be appropriated to the Department of Commerce for the Chesapeake Bay Office \$6,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2002 through 2006.”

(b) **CONFORMING AMENDMENT.**—Section 2 of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration Marine Fisheries Program Authorization Act (Public Law 98-210; 97 Stat. 1409) is amended by striking subsection (e).

(c) **MULTIPLE SPECIES MANAGEMENT STRATEGY.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Director of the Chesapeake Bay Office of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration shall begin a 5-year study, in cooperation with the scientific community of the Chesapeake Bay, appropriate State and interstate resource management entities, and appropriate Federal agencies—

(A) to determine and expand the understanding of the role and response of living resources in the Chesapeake Bay ecosystem; and

(B) to develop a multiple species management strategy for the Chesapeake Bay.

(2) **REQUIRED ELEMENTS OF STUDY.**—In order to improve the understanding necessary for the development of the strategy under paragraph (1)(B), the study shall—

(A) determine the current status and trends of fish and shellfish that live in the Chesapeake Bay and its tributaries and are selected for study;

(B) evaluate and assess interactions among the fish and shellfish referred to in subparagraph (A) and other living resources, with particular attention to the impact of changes within and among trophic levels; and

(C) recommend management actions to optimize the return of a healthy and balanced ecosystem for the Chesapeake Bay.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. GILCREST) and the gentleman from Guam (Mr. UNDERWOOD) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. GILCREST).

Mr. GILCREST. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I want to say up front that the staff on both sides of the aisle, the Democrat and Republican staff, both in our personal offices and the committee, have done excellent work on this bill to make it a bipartisan bill supported by everybody. It is also an excellent piece of legislation.

I also want to thank the ranking member, the gentleman from Guam

(Mr. UNDERWOOD), for his support of the legislation and for working with us to make sure that this bill passed the committee and will now pass the House and eventually become law.

I know the bill does not deal with Guam exclusively, it deals with the Chesapeake Bay region and the China watershed, but his tireless efforts to support this legislation bodes well for his professionalism.

Madam Speaker, H.R. 642 reauthorizes the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration's Chesapeake Bay Office and clarifies its role in coordinating NOAA's bay activities. This legislation is similar to a measure we introduced last year. It is also similar to separate legislation introduced last year by my colleague, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN). Those bills were the subject of a committee hearing last fall. H.R. 642 is a result of that hearing and is supported by the entire Maryland delegation.

In addition to reauthorizing the NOAA Chesapeake Bay Office, H.R. 642 would create two new very interesting requirements. The first would be a 5-year study leading to the development of a multiple-species living marine resources management strategy for the Chesapeake Bay.

I do not want to go over that too fast. It is a multiple-species living marine resources management strategy. What exactly does that mean? Let me give just a small example.

In the Chesapeake Bay, we have sunlight and we have nutrients. The sunlight is the engine behind what gives the Chesapeake Bay life. So to a certain extent, the sunlight and nutrients generate a microorganism, something called phytoplankton, a little tiny microorganism, which is then eaten by another tiny microorganism called zooplankton. The zooplankton is then eaten by a little fish called menhaden. The menhaden is eaten by a bigger fish called rockfish, or striped bass.

Now, to a small extent, that is an example of a food web, or something we refer to today as an ecosystem. In the bill, it talks about a multiple-species management strategy.

What has happened in the Chesapeake Bay, and the reason there is a need for this legislation, is that we have sunlight and nutrients now, but now we have too many nutrients. That means we have too much of the first microorganism, or phytoplankton. When we have too much of that phytoplankton, the zooplankton cannot eat enough of it, so a lot of the phytoplankton, that microorganism, falls to the bottom after it dies. It uses a lot of oxygen as it decays.

As a result of that loss of oxygen, we do not have a good-quality environment for the phytoplankton anymore, and we come up with another microorganism called the dinoflagellate. Because the dinoflagellate can prosper in low oxygen, it is not nearly as good a quality food for the zooplankton. Then the zooplankton are not as nutritious.

Then the menhaden that eat the zooplankton, they begin to fail, not only because the quality of their environment is reduced, but because they are overharvested by way too many times.

So what does that do to the rockfish at the top of the food web? The rockfish do not have enough menhaden to eat. So what do the rockfish do? They go after the crabs.

What I am trying to explain here is as soon as human activity, which causes too many nutrients in the Chesapeake Bay, interrupts or disrupts the ecosystem or the food web, we need to employ some quality legislation to understand the mechanics of the natural processes. That is what this bill does.

The second requirement of this bill would be to establish a community-based fishery and habitat restoration small grant program for the Chesapeake Bay watershed, a small grant program for activities to understand the nature of the food web that we have disrupted.

How do we get back in to bring that food web back into originally what it was designed for? It was designed; it has a design to it. Sometimes we refer to it in the Chesapeake Bay region as the mechanics of creation. If we can understand that, we can fix these problems.

□ 1415

So the small watershed grants will plant grass to improve the quality of the water; build oyster reefs to filter out some of those nutrients; stabilize shore lines, I think the way they are supposed to be stabilized so they can be habitat for other wildlife; and spawning areas for fish.

As a representative of the district that surrounds the Chesapeake Bay, I am well aware of and appreciate the quality of the work done by the Chesapeake Bay office. I commend Judith Freeman, director of the Chesapeake Bay Office, for her efforts to improve the environmental quality and public stewardship of the bay.

The Chesapeake Bay is vitally important to our district and the mid-Atlantic States. Every corner of Maryland's first district is dependent in one way or other on the health of the Chesapeake Bay. From the State capital in Annapolis, home of constituents as diverse as the United States Naval Academy, recreational boaters, to the Eastern Shore, where thousands of watermen rely on the health of the bay to sustain their families, the Chesapeake Bay is a focal point of life for my constituents; therefore, the success of the Chesapeake Bay Office is of critical concern to them and myself.

Madam Speaker, I want to quote one more person in this dialogue we are having here, and that is Rachael Carson, the author of the book that exploded the idea that the environment is important in her book “Silent Spring.” Rachael Carson always found it a

strange phenomenon that individual people when you talk to them about science consider the only people concerned with the details and the mechanics of natural processes or science were scientists locked away in some obscure laboratory, and they very rarely ever left that scientific perspective.

Madam Speaker, science is a wonderful form of dialogue and conversation not only for us, but certainly for young children in school. To understand what keeps life on this planet alive is an extraordinary thing that all of us should talk about a little bit more.

Madam Speaker, I urge an aye vote on this important legislation.

Madam Speaker, I also want to thank my colleagues from Maryland and the gentleman from Guam (Mr. UNDERWOOD) for their support.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. UNDERWOOD asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Madam Speaker, I support H.R. 642, a noncontroversial bill, which would reauthorize the Chesapeake Bay Office of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, and as indicated by the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. GILCREST), chairman of the Subcommittee on Fisheries Conservation, Wildlife and Oceans, who has aptly demonstrated not only his commitment to this particular piece of legislation, but certainly his knowledge about the mechanics of it and the necessity for it.

Since 1992, the Chesapeake Bay Office has functioned effectively to incorporate NOAA's impressive scientific research and marine resource management programs into the comprehensive Federal and multi-state effort to restore the Chesapeake Bay ecosystem. It is one of the best examples I know of that demonstrates how NOAA brings science and service together.

H.R. 642 would provide a much-deserved increase in funding for this office. The bill would also authorize some new activities, many of which have been outlined already by the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. GILCREST), most notably a local fishery and habitat restoration grant program, which will promote new opportunities for NOAA to contribute throughout the bay.

The legislation has received strong bipartisan support from the entire Maryland Congressional delegation. The administration also supports H.R. 642, and I urge an aye vote on this common sense good piece of legislation.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GILCREST. Madam Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from Maryland (Mrs. MORELLA).

Mrs. MORELLA. Madam Speaker, I, first of all, want to thank the gentleman from Maryland (Mr.

GILCREST), the sponsor of this legislation for yielding the time to me and obviously for sponsoring the legislation.

Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 642, the NOAA Chesapeake Bay Office Reauthorization. The gentleman from Maryland (Mr. GILCREST), my good friend, should be commended for this fine legislation. In addition, I offer my congratulations to the gentleman as he embarks as the chairman of the Subcommittee on Fisheries Conservation, Wildlife and Oceans.

It is only appropriate that the first legislation considered by his subcommittee is this bill, which will benefit and improve the Chesapeake Bay.

I want to also thank my colleagues from Maryland, I see the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) over there and I see the gentleman from Guam (Mr. UNDERWOOD), and I want to thank the others who have supported this legislation.

The Chesapeake Bay, our Nation's largest estuary, is an incredibly complex ecosystem. The bay is one of our Nation's most valuable natural resources. Its rich ecosystem, with rivers, wetlands, trees, and the bay, itself, supports and provides a natural habitat for over 3,600 species of plants, fish, and animals.

We know that about 15 million people now live in the bay watershed, which include parts of six States and the entire District of Columbia. These persons are at all times just a few steps from one or more of the 100,000 stream and river tributaries ultimately draining into the bay.

Every person, plant and animal within this watershed depends on each other to help the Chesapeake Bay system thrive and function properly. These complex relationships are countless.

NOAA's Chesapeake Bay Office was first created in 1992 to coordinate NOAA's efforts under the Chesapeake Bay Program, which was a unique regional partnership of State and Federal Government agencies that has been encouraging and directing the restoration of the bay since 1983.

I am pleased that important progress has been made in renewing the bay since the Chesapeake Bay Agreement was signed in 1983. Restoration efforts, led in part by the dedicated sciences at NOAA, have had a profound impact on the health and vitality of the bay. Scientific research has led to a better understanding of the bay, including how it works, and what must be done to continue its restoration.

The NOAA's Chesapeake Bay Office brings incredible scientific knowledge and expertise. They are involved in protecting and preserving the Chesapeake Bay in many ways, from rebuilding oyster reefs to restoring critically important subaquatic vegetation.

However, we still have a long way to go before we reach our goals for a completely restored Chesapeake Bay. Many

questions about the future of the bay remain unanswered. For example, blue crabs, perhaps the best-known and most important resource of the bay, have been below the long-term average level for several years.

The oyster harvest has declined dramatically. Further efforts to reduce nutrient and sediment pollution are needed.

Madam Speaker, I am pleased that this legislation today will help us address these concerns. It will allow us to move towards the goal of a restored Chesapeake Bay. H.R. 642 will provide the NOAA's Chesapeake Bay Office with the necessary resources and authorization to continue to lead the way towards long-lasting environmental restoration of the bay.

Madam Speaker, we must preserve and protect the Chesapeake Bay, and I do support H.R. 642. I urge its swift passage.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Madam Speaker, to prove this is not simply a Maryland State concern, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT).

Mr. SCOTT. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Guam (Mr. UNDERWOOD) for yielding the time.

Madam Speaker, I want to thank also the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. GILCREST), because he and I cochair the Chesapeake Bay Watershed Task Force, and I want to thank him and the gentleman from Guam (Mr. UNDERWOOD) for their dedication to protecting the Chesapeake Bay.

The bill before us today reauthorizes the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration Chesapeake Bay Office through 2006. The Chesapeake Bay Office was established in 1992 to provide a focal point for NOAA's efforts and those efforts undertaken by partners of the Chesapeake Bay Program.

For nearly 10 years now, the Chesapeake Bay Office has played a vital role in coordinating efforts between NOAA and Federal and State governments in the Chesapeake Bay watershed. It has acted as a positive force in managing and preserving this unique natural treasure.

This legislation before us not only authorizes the appropriations for the Chesapeake Bay Office, but it also begins a new small grant program. Local governments and organizations, such as educational institutions or community organizations within the Chesapeake Bay watershed would be eligible for grants which may make improvements to fish passageways, create natural or artificial reefs for habitats, restore wetlands or sea grass or produce oysters for restoration projects.

These projects could advance the essential knowledge and information that is necessary in order for us to restore our Nation's most cherished waterway, the Chesapeake Bay, which not only has significant environmental impact on Virginia and many other States, but also contributes enormously to our recreational activities and to our economy. I, therefore,

Madam Speaker, urge my colleagues to support the bill.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN).

Mr. CARDIN. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Guam (Mr. UNDERWOOD), my friend, for yielding this time to me and for his leadership in moving this legislation, and also the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. GILCHREST), my colleague, in working together to bring forward this very important reauthorization legislation that will help continue the Federal partnership in restoring the Chesapeake Bay, the largest estuary in our Nation.

In 1991, original authorizations for NOAA's participation was passed by this Congress, and since that time, NOAA has been an instrumental partner in our efforts that involve not only the State of Maryland, but our surrounding States; not just State government, but local governments; not just government, but the private sector. We have worked together in partnership and have made tremendous progress in restoring the Chesapeake Bay.

This legislation not only reauthorizes NOAA's participation, but establishes small grant programs to local governments, community organizations, educational institutions to restore fisheries and habitats.

Madam Speaker, I say personally I know the groups that qualify for these funds. They are out there every day helping us restoring the waters and stirring the banks, cleaning up the waters, helping us in a major way. This legislation will mean that there will be additional resources available to these local groups to help them.

The legislation also provides for a 5-year study, which I think is extremely important on the multispecies management plan. For too long, we have been looking at individual species. This legislation will allow us to look at all the species within the bay as to how they interact with each other.

We increase the authorization to \$6 million through fiscal year 2006; and in combination, this legislation will increase NOAA's participation in partnership to restore the bay.

Madam Speaker, I congratulate all for moving this legislation so early. It will help us in our efforts not only in Maryland, not only in the communities that surround the Chesapeake Bay, but as a model for our Nation as to the right way to clean up a major body, a multijurisdictional body of water.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the legislation.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to urge everyone to vote aye on this, and also to congratulate the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. GILCHREST) for this very fine piece of legislation.

Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GILCHREST. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Guam (Mr. UNDERWOOD) once again, and certainly the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) for helping us with this legislation.

One last very brief comment on the Chesapeake Bay watershed. The Chesapeake Bay itself, about 100 years ago, at the turn of the century, we took out of the bay on an annual basis up to 15 million bushels of oysters, 15 million. It was the engine that drove the economy of the State of Maryland and Virginia and, to some extent, Pennsylvania, for the commercial harvest, for the recreational activities, for all the spin-off economic resources that depended on the Chesapeake Bay, 15 million bushels the oysters. We are, in a good year now, in a very good year, down to 300,000 bushels of oysters.

With this legislation, we can understand the nature of the mechanics of the ecosystem, how the food web works. Human activity degraded the bay; human ingenuity will restore it.

I urge an aye vote on H.R. 642.

Mr. GILCHREST. Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. EMERSON). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. GILCHREST) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 642, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds of those present have voted in the affirmative.

Mr. GILCHREST. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY TO HAVE UNTIL FRIDAY, APRIL 20, 2001, TO FILE LEGISLATIVE REPORTS ON H.R. 392, H.R. 503, H.R. 863, H.R. 1209, AND H.J. RES. 41

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary have until Friday, April 20, to file legislative reports on the following: H.R. 392, Private Relief Bill for Nancy Wilson; H.R. 503, Unborn Victims of Violence Act of 2001; H.R. 863, Consequence for Juvenile Offenders Act of 2001; H.R. 1209, Child Status Protection Act of 2001; and H.J. Res. 41, Tax Limitation Constitutional Amendment.

This request has been cleared with the minority.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

□ 1430

NEED-BASED EDUCATIONAL AID ACT OF 2001

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 768) to amend the Improving America's Schools Act of 1994 to make permanent the favorable treatment of need-based educational aid under the antitrust laws.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 768

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Need-Based Educational Aid Act of 2001".

SEC. 2. AMENDMENTS.

Section 568(d) of the Improving America's Schools Act of 1994 (15 U.S.C. 1 note) is repealed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. EMERSON). Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on H.R. 768, the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, today the House considers H.R. 768, the Need-Based Educational Aid Act of 2001. This bill was introduced by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH), and the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK). It makes permanent an antitrust exemption that allows universities to agree on common standards of need when awarding financial aid.

This exemption has been passed on a temporary basis several times without controversy, and the current version is set to expire at the end of September. It appears to be working well, and I am hopeful that it now can be made permanent.

In a moment the sponsors of the bill, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH) and the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK), will seek time for a further explanation. I appreciate their work on this bill.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. I wanted to thank the author of the bill, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK), who was last seen leaving the floor, and I want to yield him some time because I do not think this is going to take long.

What we were doing for many years on need-based educational aid assistance was passing temporary exemptions to the antitrust act. It worked fine. And now we have decided to permanentize it, thanks to the efforts of the gentleman from Massachusetts and as well as the gentleman from Texas.

It is a great piece of legislation, and it represented probably the most vigorous high point of antitrust enforcement during the Bush, Senior, administration on record.

I rise in support of H.R. 768, the "Need-Based Educational Aid Act of 2001." This bipartisan bill would make permanent an exemption in the antitrust laws that permits schools to agree to award financial aid on a need-blind basis and to use common principles of needs analysis in making their determinations.

The exemption also allows for agreement on the use of a common aid application form and the exchange of the student's financial information through a third party.

In 1992, Congress passed a similar temporary exemption, which was extended in 1994, and again extended in 1997. The exemption passed in 1997 expires later this year. During the almost ten years of its operation, we have been able to witness and evaluate the exemption, and we have found that it has worked well.

The need-based financial aid system serves important social goals that the antitrust laws do not adequately address—such as making financial aid available to the broadest number of students solely on the basis of demonstrated need. Without it, the schools would be required to compete, through financial aid awards, for the very top students.

The result would be that the very top students would get all of the aid available, which would be more than they need. The rest of the applicant pool would get less or none at all. Ultimately, such a system would undermine the principles of need-based aid and need-blind admissions which are so important to achieving educational equality.

No student who is otherwise qualified ought to be denied the opportunity to go to one of the Nation's most prestigious schools because of the financial situation of his or her family. H.R. 768 will help protect need-based aid and need-blind admissions and preserve that opportunity.

Madam Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK) for any comments he would like to make.

Mr. FRANK. Madam Speaker, I thank the ranking member for yielding me this time. I want to express my appreciation to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH) for moving on this so expeditiously and to the chairman of the committee.

For people to understand this, briefly, we had a situation in which the Ivy League schools, MIT and a few others, formed what they called the overlap group. The purpose was, given that they have limited resources to give out in scholarships, and obviously there is not an infinite amount of money for universities, even wealthy ones, to give out scholarships, they wanted to avoid

the situation where they competed for desirable students who were not financially in great distress, because that would have taken money away from the pool available to help young people go to school who might not otherwise be able to.

Many of these schools strive to achieve what they call a needs-blind admission policy, or at least they used to the last time I talked. Maybe there is a new euphemism. But what it meant was that they strove to admit young men and women based on their ability to do the work of that school, and then, having admitted them, endeavored to make sure they could afford it financially by some package of financial aid from the university itself, loans, work study, Federal aid, et cetera.

The overlap group was an effort to maximize the resources that could go to the students in need, and I regard that as one of the most socially responsible things universities did. The Justice Department challenged it. Particular credit, in my judgment, goes to Massachusetts Institute of Technology, which declined to go along. Some of the other colleges thought, oh, well, the Justice Department is coming after us, we better just drop this. MIT, to its credit, said, no, we will go to court and litigate this.

During the litigation all parties then agreed to a settlement, and essentially this is the legislation that embodies the settlement, which allows some of what they used to do. It does not allow it all. If it were up to me, I would have restored totally what they were able to do. This is not a complete restoration of the overlap group, but it is a substantial restoration of their legal authority to be socially responsible.

We are not talking now about government money, now, but their private funds. What this does is allow them to try better to target the private scholarship money available to them so that it goes to help bright students who are capable of doing the work at these first-rate universities, but unable to finance it and attend the universities.

I think that is a goal all of us in this Chamber agree with, and I am, therefore, glad to be in support of this legislation.

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to add that the previous speaker went to Harvard, and the cosponsor of the bill went to Yale, and so their contributions are very important, and they did not participate in any of this funding.

Mr. FRANK. Madam Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONYERS. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. FRANK. It was MIT that was the real hero of this, and to whom I think credit should be given.

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Madam Speaker, as one who went to the Uni-

versity of Wisconsin, Madison, that has much better football and basketball teams than either Harvard or Yale, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH).

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Madam Speaker, I thank the chairman of the full committee for yielding me this time, and, Madam Speaker, I am going to go in a little more detail about the history of this bill and the necessity for it.

Beginning in the mid-1950s, a number of private colleges and universities agreed to award financial aid solely on the basis of demonstrated need. These schools also agreed to use common criteria to assess each student's financial need and to give the same financial aid award to students admitted to more than one member of that group of schools. From the 1950s to the late 1980s, the practice continued undisturbed.

In 1989, the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice brought suit against nine of the colleges involved that engaged in this practice. After extensive litigation, the parties reached a settlement in 1993. In 1994, and again in 1997, Congress passed a temporary exemption from the antitrust laws that codified that settlement. It allowed agreements to provide aid on the basis of need only, to use common criteria, to use a common financial aid application form, and to allow the exchange of the student's financial information through a third party. It also prohibited agreements on awards to specific students. This exemption expires on September 30, 2001.

Common treatment of these types of issues makes sense, and to my knowledge there are no complaints about the existing exemption. H.R. 768 would make the exemption passed in 1994 and 1997 permanent. It would not make any change to the substance of the exemption.

The need-based financial aid system serves worthy goals that the antitrust laws do not adequately address; namely, making financial aid available to the broadest number of students solely on the basis of demonstrated need. No student who is otherwise qualified should be denied the opportunity to go to one of these schools because of the limited financial means of his or her family. H.R. 768 would help protect need-based aid and need-blind admissions.

Madam Speaker, this legislation passed the Committee on the Judiciary with no opposition, and I urge my colleagues to support this bill as well.

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 768.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds of those present have voted in the affirmative.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

EXPRESSING SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING ESTABLISHMENT OF NATIONAL SHAKEN BABY SYNDROME AWARENESS WEEK

Mr. PLATTS. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 59) expressing the sense of Congress regarding the establishment of National Shaken Baby Syndrome Awareness Week, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. CON. RES. 59

Whereas more than 1,000,000 children were abused or neglected in the United States during the most recent year for which Government data is available regarding child abuse and neglect;

Whereas more than 3 children die from abuse or neglect each day in the United States;

Whereas, in 1998, 37.9 percent of all fatalities of children under the age of 1 were caused by child abuse or neglect, and 77.5 percent of all fatalities of children under the age of 5 were caused by child abuse or neglect;

Whereas head trauma, including the trauma known as shaken baby syndrome, is the leading cause of death of abused children;

Whereas shaken baby syndrome is the loss of vision, brain damage, paralysis, seizures, or death that is caused by severely or violently shaking a baby;

Whereas an estimated 3,000 babies, usually younger than 1 year of age, are diagnosed with shaken baby syndrome every year, with thousands more misdiagnosed or undetected;

Whereas shaken baby syndrome often results in permanent, irreparable brain damage or death;

Whereas the medical costs associated with caring for a baby suffering from shaken baby syndrome often exceed \$1,000,000 in the first few years of the life of the baby;

Whereas the most effective method for ending the occurrence of shaken baby syndrome is to prevent the abuse which causes it;

Whereas educational and prevention programs regarding shaken baby syndrome may prevent enormous medical costs and unquantifiable grief at minimal cost;

Whereas programs to prevent shaken baby syndrome have been shown to raise awareness and provide critically important information about shaken baby syndrome to parents, caregivers, day care workers, child protection employees, law enforcement personnel, health care professionals, and legal representatives;

Whereas programs and techniques to prevent child abuse and shaken baby syndrome are supported by the Shaken Baby Alliance, Children's Defense Fund, National Children's Alliance, American Humane Association, Prevent Child Abuse America, National Ex-

change Club Foundation, Child Welfare League of America, National Association of Children's Hospitals and Related Institutions, Center for Child Protection and Family Support, Inc., American Academy of Pediatrics, and American Medical Association; and

Whereas increased awareness of shaken baby syndrome and of the techniques to prevent it would help end the abuse that causes shaken baby syndrome: Now, therefore, be it Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That Congress—

(1) strongly supports efforts to protect children from abuse and neglect; and

(2) encourages the people of the United States to educate themselves regarding shaken baby syndrome and the techniques to prevent it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PLATTS) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PLATTS).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. PLATTS. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H. Con. Res. 59, as amended.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. PLATTS. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I am pleased to have the House consider House Concurrent Resolution 59, legislation introduced by the gentleman from California (Mr. McKEON), my esteemed colleague. This resolution expresses the sense of Congress regarding the prevention of shaken baby syndrome. Shaken baby syndrome is a medical term used to describe the violent shaking and resulting injury sustained from shaking a young child. Often there are no external signs of injury to a baby or young child's body, but there is injury inside, particularly in the head or behind the eyes. The term was first discussed in medical literature in 1972, but knowledge about the syndrome continues to develop today.

Shaken baby syndrome can occur when children are violently shaken, either as part of a pattern of abuse, or simply because an adult or young caretaker has momentarily succumbed to the challenges of responding to a crying baby. Violent shaking is especially dangerous to infants and young children because their neck muscles are underdeveloped, and their brain tissue is exceptionally fragile. Their small size further adds to the risk of injury. Vigorous shaking repeatedly pitches the brain in different directions.

Shaken baby syndrome can have disastrous consequences for the victim, the family, and society in total. If the child survives the syndrome, medical bills can be enormous. The victim may require lifelong care for injuries such as mental retardation and cerebral palsy. The child may even require in-

stitutionalization or other types of long-term care.

Madam Speaker, this resolution expresses Congress' support to protect children from abuse and neglect. I encourage all Members to support this resolution.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. DAVIS of Illinois asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to rise in support of this resolution, a very important resolution which seeks to protect the most innocent among us, children; children who are a few days to 5 years old. These children often need protection from parents and caregivers who shake their babies beyond control. Shaken baby syndrome is caused by vigorous shaking of an infant or young child by the arms, legs, chest or shoulders. Forceful shaking will result in brain damage, leading to mental retardation, speech and learning disabilities, paralysis, seizures, hearing loss and even deafness. It may cause bleeding around the brain and eyes, resulting in blindness.

An estimated 50,000 cases of shaken baby syndrome occur each year. One shaken baby in four dies as a result of this abuse. Some studies estimate that 15 percent of children's deaths are due to battering or shaking. The average victim is 6 to 8 months old.

Madam Speaker, we ask ourselves why babies are being shaken, and how can this resolution help. Crying is the most common trigger for shaking a baby. The normal crying infant spends 2 to 3 hours each day crying. Crying becomes particularly problematic during the 6-week to 4-month age bracket, an age period that coincides with the peak incidence of shaken baby syndrome.

□ 1445

The shaking of the infant is often repeated because the infant stops crying but only because the infant has been injured by the shaking. Shaking often occurs when a frustrated caregiver loses control with an inconsolable crying baby. Parents and caregivers must be made aware of how to deal with a crying infant and that shaking an infant is abusive and criminal. By making Americans more aware of shaken baby syndrome, we can save more of America's children. I urge my colleagues to support this resolution and help save the babies.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PLATTS. Madam Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. McKEON).

Mr. McKEON. Madam Speaker, I rise today as the proud sponsor of this legislation. This bill expresses the sense that Congress strongly supports shaken

baby syndrome prevention and urges all Americans to educate themselves about shaken baby syndrome and the techniques to prevent it.

First I would like to thank the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON), the chairman of the Committee on Government Reform, for his assistance in bringing this bill to the floor and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PLATTS) for managing the bill on the floor. I would also like to thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY), the majority whip, for his cosponsorship and his dedication to child advocacy. Also supporting this cause are the Shaken Baby Alliance, the Children's Defense Fund, the National Children's Alliance as well as many other children and family organizations.

This cause was presented to me by one of my constituents, Joyce Edson. Joyce's son, James, was shaken by his licensed child care provider between March and April of 1998. As a result, James was sent to the emergency room with a skull fracture, subdural hematoma, bilateral retinal hemorrhages and a broken right femur. All of this and he was only 5 months old. While James survived this tragic period, he unfortunately has experienced periodic seizures up to 1 year after the abuse. James is still currently under the continual care of a pediatric neurologist and an ophthalmologist. The Edson family will not know about learning disabilities or behavioral problems until he enters a more structured environment such as kindergarten or the first grade.

Madam Speaker, many other children are not as lucky as James. Each day, more than three children in the United States die from abuse and neglect. Furthermore, over 3,000 babies under the age of 1 are diagnosed with shaken baby syndrome annually while thousands more are misdiagnosed or go completely undetected. Madam Speaker, it saddens me that this situation even exists. However, I am hopeful with this resolution, Congress can increase the knowledge of and ultimately prevent this dreadful occurrence.

Therefore, I urge all my colleagues to support H. Con. Res. 59.

Mr. PLATTS. Madam Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY), the majority whip.

Mr. DELAY. Madam Speaker, I rise today to support this resolution which demonstrates the importance of National Shaken Baby Syndrome Awareness Week. I also want to thank the gentleman from California (Mr. McKEON) for bringing this issue to the House's attention during the month that President Bush has proclaimed as National Child Abuse Prevention Month and also thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PLATTS) for bringing it to the floor. It is my hope that the facts and consequences of abuse will create a national consensus that underscores the importance of prevention.

This issue requires that we answer several fundamental questions. First, what do we know about children who are abused? Second, who are the abusers? Third, what do we know about the way abuse hurts children and its attendant costs to society? And, finally, what have we learned about preventing child abuse?

Let us begin with abused children. The years before a child's 5th birthday are the most dangerous age for children in the United States. That is because more than three-quarters of the children who die from abuse are preschoolers. We know that the leading cause of death among infants is head trauma. It most often happens when abusers violently shake a baby.

Now, let us talk about the perpetrators. Nearly 9 out of every 10 perpetrators are parents. Sadly, the most dangerous place for a child to be is in a home with parents or those entrusted with their care when those people intend to abuse children.

Next, we need to consider how abuse impacts children and ponder the associated costs to society. The victims of child abuse suffer in many ways. Some die. Other kids suffer brain damage. Many are haunted through life by a familiar pattern of debilitating injuries. For the young victims of shaken baby syndrome, approximately 15 to 30 percent die while the rest of these children suffer from disabilities that last their whole lives. Of the few SBS victims who escape without physical injuries, many are destined to suffer more abuse from the people who care for them. We find a consistent pattern of symptoms among abused children: school failure, feelings of worthlessness, and the aggressive behavior that too often culminates in criminal activity.

It is estimated that each child abuse case costs society \$2,500 initially. And that expense only covers the short-term costs of abuse, including the initial investigation and the short-term placement of the child in a safe home. All told, this costs \$3 billion every year. When a child is hospitalized or placed in foster care, the costs soar higher.

Finally, let us talk about our ability to prevent child abuse. We know that it is very difficult to prevent very young children from being abused by their parents. Half of the children killed by abusers are from families who have never been investigated. Even among cases that are under active investigation, abused children are left at risk in dangerous homes. An unpopular body of evidence warns us that every abusive family cannot be sufficiently changed to protect every child. But that does not mean that we ought to abandon the goal of protecting every child. Prevention is worth the risk. It is worth it even if some programs fail. Prevention is worth it because we may still be able to save additional lives through education, counseling, and home visits by specially trained nurses.

Preventing child abuse is a pro-life policy. Some programs do cut child

abuse rates. These programs should be supported across our society by Federal, State and local governments as well as private and faith-based organizations. Only by combining our prayers and efforts will we protect every possible young life. That goal is worthy of our full commitment.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I reiterate my strong support for this resolution.

Madam Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PLATTS. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

As the parent of two young children, I especially commend and appreciate the efforts of the gentleman from California (Mr. McKEON) for introducing this important resolution and for his efforts to bring it to the floor to raise the awareness of the public of the need to protect our children.

Most of the time, shaken baby syndrome occurs because a parent or caretaker is frustrated or angry with the child. Other times children become victims when a parent or caretaker, not realizing how seriously this behavior can harm, throws a child into the air vigorously or plays too roughly or hits an infant too hard on the back. Anyone who takes care of a baby or small child, parents, older siblings, baby-sitters, child care professionals, grandparents and others, should be reminded to never shake babies or small children. There are organizations in each of our communities that can provide help to parents whose patience has been strained by the burden of caring for an infant who cries continually or who might need more help with parenting or coping skills.

I want to add my words of thanks to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON), the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SCARBOROUGH), the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN), and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS), the committee and subcommittee chairmen, and ranking members for working expeditiously to bring this important resolution to the floor. I urge all Members to lend their support to this resolution which seeks to protect our Nation's most precious resource and our Nation's most innocent citizens, our children.

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Con. Res. 59, which expresses the sense of Congress that a National Shaken Baby Syndrome Awareness Week should be established.

As a cosponsor of this resolution, I want to bring attention to a problem that is often overlooked: Shaken Baby Syndrome (SBS). This issue was brought to my attention by one of my constituents, Janet Goree of Clearwater, Florida, whose granddaughter Kimberlin lost her life as a result of SBS. While nothing can be done for Kimberlin, it is my sincere hope that bringing the public's attention to this important issue will prevent further tragedies.

Shaken Baby Syndrome (SBS) is a serious acquired traumatic brain injury caused by "shaking" a child in order to stop them from

crying. SBS frequently occurs in children less than one year of age, although there have been documented cases of SBS in children as old as five years of age.

Madam Speaker, most individuals with experience dealing with small children can relate to the frustration of not knowing how to meet the needs of a consistently crying child. However, it is important that everyone understands that infants cannot and should never be shaken as a remedy to stop them from crying.

The typical causes of SBS is an adult holding a child by the arms or trunk and shaking him or her back and forth with a repeated force. When a child is shaken, delicate veins between the brain and skull are ruptured and begin to bleed. Naturally, the pooling of blood between the skull and the dura—a fibrous membrane that lies next to the brain—causes the formation of subdural hematomas, which produces pressure that, along with the natural swelling of the bruised brain, causes damage to brain cells. Once brain cells are damaged, they can never be regenerated or replaced.

The swelling and pressure associated with SBS also causes the brain to push and squeeze down on the brainstem, which controls vital functions such as breathing and heartbeat. If the swelling and pressure are not alleviated, vital functions will cease and the child will die. Previous studies have suggested that 15–30% of the children die, and it is estimated that only 15% escape SBS without any type of permanent damage.

Medications may be administered to reduce the swelling and surgical methods may be used to relieve pressure on the brain, but an ounce of prevention is always worth a pound of cure. Parents, child care workers, and anyone who deals with small children should remember that much less force is required to cause significant damage to a child's brain than an adult's. Although no scientific studies have documented the exact amount of force needed to cause SBS in humans, most medical professionals recognize that shaking is often so violent that any reasonable person would know it to be dangerous to a child.

I am pleased that individuals such as Janet Goree are taking action to educate the public about the dangers of Shaken Baby Syndrome. The Shaken Baby Alliance maintains a database of victim families willing to offer support, as well as provides volunteers to run an electronic mail support group for families as well as professionals. Information on the Alliance can be found on their website at www.shakenbaby.com.

On Saturday, April 28, the Shaken Baby Alliance is sponsoring a candlelight vigil on the West Front steps of the Capitol to remember the lives of those children lost to SBS and shine a light on this problem so that future tragedies can be prevented.

Madam Speaker, Shaken Baby Syndrome is a form of child abuse. Like any other form of abuse against children, it cannot be tolerated. I hope that my colleagues will support H. Con. Res. 59, and join us in efforts to educate the public about SBS, reminding our constituents to “never, never, never shake a baby.”

Mr. PLATTS. Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. EMERSON). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PLATTS) that the House suspend the rules and agree to

the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 59, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the concurrent resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

The title of the concurrent resolution was amended so as to read: “Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress regarding the prevention of shaken baby syndrome.”

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXPRESSING SENSE OF HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES REGARDING HUMAN RIGHTS IN CUBA

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 91) expressing the sense of the House of Representatives regarding the human rights situation in Cuba.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 91

Whereas, according to the Department of State and international human rights organizations, the Government of Cuba continues to commit widespread and well-documented human rights violations against the Cuban people and to detain hundreds more as political prisoners;

Whereas the Castro regime systematically violates all of the fundamental civil and political rights of the Cuban people, denying freedoms of speech, press, assembly, movement, religion, and association, the right to change their government, and the right to due process and fair trials;

Whereas, in law and in practice, the Government of Cuba restricts the freedom of religion of the Cuban people and engages in efforts to control and monitor religious institutions through surveillance, infiltration, evictions, restrictions on access to computer and communication equipment, and harassment of religious professionals and lay persons;

Whereas the totalitarian regime of Fidel Castro actively suppresses all peaceful opposition and dissent by the Cuban people using undercover agents, informers, rapid response brigades, Committees for the Defense of the Revolution, surveillance, phone tapping, intimidation, defamation, arbitrary detention, house arrest, arbitrary searches, evictions, travel restrictions, politically-motivated dismissals from employment, and forced exile;

Whereas workers' rights are effectively denied by a system in which foreign investors are forced to contract labor from the Government of Cuba and to pay the regime in hard currency knowing that the regime will pay less than 5 percent of these wages in local currency to the workers themselves;

Whereas these abuses by the Government of Cuba violate internationally accepted norms of conduct;

Whereas the House of Representatives is mindful of the admonishment of former Mexican President Ernesto Zedillo during the last Ibero-American Summit in Havana, Cuba, that “[t]here can be no sovereign nations without free men and women [. . .] men and women who can freely exercise their essential freedoms: freedom of thought and opinion, freedom of participation, freedom of dissent, freedom of decision”;

Whereas President Vaclav Havel, an essential figure in the Czech Republic's transition to democracy, has counseled that “[w]e thus know that by voicing open criticism of un-

democratic conditions in Cuba, we encourage all the brave Cubans who endure persecution and years of prison for their loyalty to the ideals of freedom and human dignity”;

Whereas former President Lech Walesa, leader of the Polish solidarity movement, has urged the world to “mobilize its resources, just as was done in support of Polish Solidarnosc and the Polish workers, to express their support for Cuban workers and to monitor labor rights” in Cuba;

Whereas efforts to document, expose, and address human rights abuses in Cuba are complicated by the fact that the Government of Cuba continues to deny international human rights and humanitarian monitors access to the country;

Whereas Pax Christi further reports that these efforts are complicated because “a conspiracy of silence has fallen over Cuba” in which diplomats and entrepreneurs refuse even to discuss labor rights and other human rights issues in Cuba, some “for fear of endangering the relations with the Cuban government”, and businessmen investing in Cuba “openly declare that the theme of human rights was not of their concern”;

Whereas the annual meeting of the United Nations Commission on Human Rights in Geneva provides an excellent forum to spotlight human rights and expressing international support for improved human rights performance in Cuba and elsewhere;

Whereas the goal of United States policy in Cuba is to promote a peaceful transition to democracy through an active policy of assisting the forces of change on the island;

Whereas the United States may provide assistance through appropriate nongovernmental organizations to help individuals and organizations to promote nonviolent democratic change and promote respect for human rights in Cuba; and

Whereas the President is authorized to engage in democracy-building efforts in Cuba, including the provision of (1) publications and other informational materials on transitions to democracy, human rights, and market economies to independent groups in Cuba, (2) humanitarian assistance to victims of political repression and their families, (3) support for democratic and human rights groups in Cuba, and (4) support for visits and permanent deployment of democratic and international human rights monitors in Cuba: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That—

(1) the House of Representatives condemns the repressive and totalitarian actions of the Government of Cuba against the Cuban people; and

(2) it is the sense of the House of Representatives that the President—

(A) should have an action-oriented policy of directly assisting the Cuban people and independent organizations, modeled on United States support under former President Ronald Reagan, including support by United States trade unions, for Poland's Solidarity movement (“Solidarnosc”), to strengthen the forces of change and to improve human rights within Cuba; and

(B) should make all efforts necessary at the meeting of the United Nations Human Rights Commission in Geneva in 2001 to obtain the passage by the Commission of a resolution condemning the Government of Cuba for its human rights abuses, and to secure the appointment of a Special Rapporteur for Cuba.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) and the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN).

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the resolution under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise to render my strong support for House Resolution 91, a resolution which documents and condemns the systematic repression of the Cuban people by Cuba's totalitarian regime and urges the member countries of the United Nations Commission on Human Rights to do the same. This resolution was passed with bipartisan support by the Committee on International Relations last Wednesday, March 29. We thank the leadership on both sides of the aisle for understanding the importance of moving this measure quickly through the House.

H. Res. 91 gives the Cuban people a voice that has been denied to them by the tyrannical regime that represses them. It serves to empower those who are struggling to bring democracy to their island nation of Cuba. It also sends a clear signal to the world and specifically to the member countries of the U.N. Commission on Human Rights that the United States Congress stands firm in our commitment to human rights and freedom, that the U.S. supports the Cuban people and condemns the abhorrent behavior of the Cuban regime. It calls on the member countries of the U.N. Commission on Human Rights to adhere to the Geneva Convention which stipulates that the observance of human rights cannot be conditioned, that no external action can justify violations of the fundamental rights of every human being.

As Mexico's foreign minister, Dr. Jorge Castaneda, stated on March 20 during his address to the commission in Geneva: "The status of human rights in any nation is a legitimate concern of consequence to the international community as a whole. The task of promoting their enforcement and respect is an undertaking incumbent to all governments and to all peoples."

My dear colleagues, how much we wish that there were no need for this resolution. How we wish that the Cuban people were free from the shackles of tyranny, able to exercise their rights endowed to them by our Creator. Unfortunately, that is still a dream. The crackdown on dissidents, the detentions, the harassments, intimidation, physical and psychological torture have intensified, not decreased. Pax Christi, Freedom House, the Committee to Protect Journalists, the Inter-American Commission on Human

Rights, and our own State Department all provide ample evidence of this grim reality. The intensification of abuses prompted Amnesty International to send a letter in February of this year to the Cuban authorities expressing its concerns at the serious escalation in the arrests and the harassment of political opponents inside the island.

Amnesty's letter stated: "The increasing number of people jailed for peacefully exercising their rights to freedom of expression clearly demonstrates the level to which the government will go in order to weaken the political opposition and suppress dissidents."

In just the first week of November of 2000, 27 independent journalists and dissident leaders were arrested. Over the weekend of December 8, 100 dissidents were arrested by Cuban state security to block activities coinciding with World Human Rights Day and with the anniversary of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. Thousands of others continue to languish in squalid jail cells, devoid of light, of food, and of medical attention. Jorge Luis Garcia Perez Antunez, an Afro-Cuban dissident and Amnesty International prisoner of conscience, has been in prison since March 1990. He has been beaten, tortured, his hands and feet bound to each other and attacked by dogs who have clawed into his flesh.

□ 1500

He continues to protest the regime's human rights abuses from within his jail cell, conducting hunger strikes and writing testimonials which document the atrocities committed inside Cuba's prisons.

Then there is the case of Maritza Lugo Fernandez, vice president of the democratic movement, "30 de Noviembre-Frank Pais," and Dr. Oscar Elias Biscet of the Lawton Foundation of Human Rights, who continue to suffer "tapiados" in a small, humid cell, without windows, a solid steel door with excrement and urine on the floor.

The recently released State Department Human Rights report underscores that prison conditions continue to be harsh and, indeed, life threatening.

Prison guards and state security officials subject human rights and pro-democracy activists to beatings and threats of physical violence; to systematic and psychological intimidation; to lengthy periods of isolation, as well as to detention and imprisonment in cells with common and violent criminals; to sexually aggressive inmates and state security agents who are posing as prisoners.

Religious persecution has intensified with the Ministry of Interior engaging in active efforts to control and monitor the country's religious institutions, including surveillance, raids, evictions, and harassment of religious worshippers. The regime maintained the strict censorship of news and information, both domestic and foreign, with accredited foreign media facing pos-

sible sentences up to 20 years in prison if the information is not acceptable to Castro's regime.

Cuba's dictatorship has made it a priority to prevent the contact between Cuban pro-democracy advocates and the outside world.

In the last year, it arrested and interrogated Latvian pro-democracy activists, Romanian, Polish, Swedish and French journalists, a Czech member of parliament, and a former finance minister, and countless others because they met with dissidents and opposition leaders. These foreign visitors did not allow themselves or their actions to be controlled by the dictatorship. They chose to shine the light of truth on Cuba, and today, Madam Speaker, we in Congress can do the same.

I urge our colleagues to vote for this important measure and to do it for them. As the posters show on the wall, the families of Cuba's political prisoners, do it for their sons, for their daughters, for their mothers, for their fathers, husbands and wives; for Cuba's dissidents and for their opposition. Vote for House Resolution 91 because it is right and because it is just.

As the global leader, the United States has as our duty and obligation the responsibility to carry forth our message of freedom; and let us begin by voting yes on House Resolution 91.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LANTOS. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, let me first congratulate my good friend and colleague, the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN), for her leadership on this matter.

Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of this resolution. The United Nations Human Rights Commission is meeting as we speak, and it will soon be considering country-specific resolutions, including a resolution on Cuba and the appalling human rights situation there.

The Cuban government, Madam Speaker, remains the last dark stain of totalitarianism in the Western Hemisphere, which is otherwise marching forward towards increasingly democratic and open societies.

Our State Department Country Report on Human Rights for the year just ended, again describes the Government of Cuba as having continued to violate systematically the fundamental civil and political rights of its citizens. The State Department report states the Cuban government severely restricts worker rights, including the right to form independent unions.

One of the most significant aspects of this resolution is providing assistance to independent nongovernmental organizations and independent trade unions that can make an enormous contribution to the improvement of human rights in Cuba, and I strongly welcome the resolution's focus on this issue.

I also want to recognize the ranking Democratic member of the Subcommittee on Western Hemisphere, the

gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ), for his extraordinary leadership in this important arena. He was one of the first to propose directing assistance to these kinds of activities.

We all hope that the U.N. Commission on Human Rights will provide for the appointment of a special rapporteur for Cuba, who could give an independent and objective view of the human rights conditions on the island. I urge all of my colleagues to support H. Res. 91.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Madam Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH), the vice chairman of our committee.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Madam Speaker, I thank my good friend, the gentleman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN), for yielding me this time.

Madam Speaker, I am very proud to be the principal sponsor of this resolution on human rights in Cuba and especially grateful to the chairwoman of the Subcommittee of International Relations and Human Rights, the gentleman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN), for her courage, for her consistency in promoting human rights in Cuba and all around the world. That consistency, I think, is very much needed in politics and in statesmanship, and I applaud her for it.

I also want to thank the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DIAZ-BALART), who has been outstanding in his defense of those who labor against all odds time and time again. Mr. DIAZ-BALART is a powerful voice in Congress on behalf of the persecuted and opposed. It is an honor to be his friend and colleague.

We had the only hearing last year on Elian Gonzalez when he was abducted and sent back to Cuba. We heard from a number of people who dealt with children's rights—or the lack of children's rights—in Cuba, who talked about how the child is molded by Marxist ideology and that the parents have little or no rights with regard to their own offspring. We heard testimony from Reverend Walker who cited Matthew 25, one of my favorite teachings in the Bible, which talks about our Lord saying, "When I was hungry did you feed me, when I was naked did you clothe me?" And he was defending the Cuban dictatorship. Amazingly, he said that he saw the fulfillment of Matthew 25 in Cuba, which was an astounding and patently untrue statement to be made by a clergyman.

Then I asked him about a portion of Matthew 25 which he somehow left out. Jesus said: "When I was in prison, did you visit me?" So we asked him—I asked him and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DIAZ-BALART) jumped in right after me—did you Rev. Walker ever visit any of the 400, maybe as many as 1,200, political dissidents who have languished in Castro's gulags day in and day out? Did you ever visit any of those?

He said, oh, yes. Then the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DIAZ-BALART) asked if I would yield and he jumped in and said, "Name them."

Not one single person was named because apparently he had never visited, to the best of our knowledge, any specific dissident; never spoke to power the dictatorship that is to say to Castro, in Havana of the needs and the daily degradations that are suffered and endured by those who labor for democracy.

As this resolution attests, and other speakers will surely amplify, the Castro regime is a totalitarian government that routinely employs torture, extrajudicial killings, forced abortion, and other gross abuses against its own citizens.

In my remarks, I would like to concentrate some of my time on the particularly grave situation of human rights defenders, the brave men and women inside of Cuba who dare to criticize the actions of the regime or who simply advocate compliance with the minimum standards of civility and decency set forth in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

One thing that frequently happens to human rights defenders in Cuba is that they are subjected to what the government calls "acts of repudiation." Here is what the most recent Country Report on Human Rights Practices issued by our State Department had to say about these acts. At government instigation, and I quote,

"Members of state-controlled mass organizations, fellow workers or neighbors of intended victims are obliged to stage public protests against those who dissent from the government policies, shouting obscenities and often causing damage to the homes and property of those targeted. Physical attacks on the victims sometimes occur. Police and state security agents are often present but take no action to prevent or to end the attacks. Those who refuse to participate in these actions face disciplinary action, including loss of employment."

If a human rights defender persists in disagreeing with the government, he or she may be committed to a psychiatric institution. Like its former ally and protector, the Soviet Union, the Cuban government abuses psychiatry to imprison religious and political dissenters under the rubric of such diagnoses as, quote, "apathy towards socialism, or," and I quote, "delusions of defending human rights."

Last year, Dr. Oscar Biscet criticized the government for a wide range of human rights violations, including its policy of forcing women and girls to have abortions. Fidel Castro called Biscet a "little crazy man." The police then took Dr. Biscet to a psychiatric hospital for testing.

Dr. Biscet is now serving a 3-year sentence for the crime of what they call "dangerousness". Recently for fasting in remembrance of the murder of the men and women on the 13th of March, the boat that was deliberately cleared of its occupants and who were drowned by Castro's thugs, Dr. Biscet

got over a month of solitary confinement simply because he fasted in protest.

Madam Speaker, political and religious prisoners are often subjected to torture and a number have died in prison due to the effects of such mistreatment and denial of proper medical care.

Madam Speaker, reasonable people may have some disagreement about what we should do from time to time with regard to U.S. policy for these brutal acts. Some believe in a policy of so-called constructive engagement. I strongly believe that our policy of isolating the regime subject to carefully defined humanitarian exceptions for food and medicine that are already a part of U.S. law with respect to Cuba is the right policy.

The one thing we should all agree on, whatever our differences on other aspects of U.S. policy, is that the United States should tell the truth. Indeed, the whole purpose of the U.N. Human Rights Commission now meeting in Geneva is to provide a forum in which representatives of sovereign nations will speak to each other openly and honestly about human rights. This is not always as easy as it sounds, because the Commission's membership includes such world-class human rights violators as the People's Republic of China, Vietnam, Libya, Iraq, and Saudi Arabia; and it also includes Cuba, whose delegate stood up in Geneva last week and proudly reported that, and I quote, "there are no human rights violations in Cuba."

Give me a break, Madam Speaker. What utter nonsense.

Madam Speaker, a strong bipartisan vote for today's resolution will send a signal to Havana, to the community of nations assembled in Geneva, and to the victims themselves, that we Americans remain united in our commitment to tell the truth, and our commitment to the well being of those who suffer daily for democracy and human rights; and it is our hope that the truth, with the help of God, will set the Cuban people free.

Mr. LANTOS. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I want to strongly commend my good friend and colleague, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH), for his powerful and eloquent statement.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Madam Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN), the chairman emeritus of our Committee on International Relations.

(Mr. GILMAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GILMAN. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to rise in strong support of the adoption of H. Res. 91, which expresses the sense of the House regarding the human rights situation in Cuba.

I commend the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH), our distinguished vice chairman of the Subcommittee on International Operations and Human Rights, for introducing this resolution, and my colleagues on both sides of the aisle for joining us in cosponsoring this resolution, particularly the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN); and the ranking minority member of our Committee on International Relations, the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS); and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DIAZ-BALART); and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ).

With the rise of democratic dissent in Cuba, Fidel Castro has been forced to increase his efforts to isolate courageous dissidents from their international supporters, but this has become increasingly awkward for one of the world's last surviving Communist dictatorships.

When Germany's foreign minister, Joschka Fischer, made an issue of this case and announced his intention to meet with dissidents in Cuba, his visit to Havana was abruptly cancelled by the Cuban government.

Foreign journalists in Cuba have come under increasing pressure in recent months, and Mr. Castro has lashed out at several foreign leaders for criticizing his outrageous conduct. It would appear that Mr. Castro is willing to sacrifice his carefully packaged international image in order to prevent fellow Cubans who are opposed to his regime from receiving moral support or even having contact with citizens of democratic nations.

□ 1515

Next month, the U.N. Commission on Human Rights will be considering a resolution regarding the human rights situation in Cuba. It is extremely important that this resolution be approved. Moreover, we must not accept any attempts to insert language in that resolution seeking to draw moral equivalency between the Castro regime's systematic repression of the Cuban people and our embargo, which is intended to pressure that very same regime to free the Cuban people.

Accordingly, Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to fully support this bipartisan resolution.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Madam Speaker, I yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DIAZ-BALART), with whom I am proud to be going to Geneva for the human rights convention next week, but before doing so, I would ask that the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) yield to us the remainder of his time so that I may yield it to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DIAZ-BALART).

Mr. LANTOS. Madam Speaker, I yield the remainder of my time to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN).

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Madam Speaker, I would inquire, then, as to the remaining time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. EMERSON). The total time remaining is 20 minutes.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Madam Speaker, I yield the remaining time to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DIAZ-BALART).

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Madam Speaker, late last night I was walking through what I consider these hallowed halls, and I came across near the Rotunda two monuments, statues, of two universal men who I am thinking about at this time. One is Kossuth, the apostle of Hungarian freedom. The other is Raoul Wallenberg, a Swedish diplomat who saved tens of thousands of lives during the Holocaust. I know the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) has had much to do with the fact that in these hallowed halls we have those reminders of those universal statesmen.

I realized once again last night, first, what an extraordinary honor and privilege it is to be able to serve in this Congress. In addition to that, I realized once again last night that this Congress of the United States of America is the center of dignity and democracy for the entire world, for the entire world.

The gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS), for whom I have ultimate admiration, was born in a land that saw much suffering in the 20th century and now, fortunately, is free. The gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) and I were born in a land that has seen much suffering for the last 42 years and, unfortunately, is still not free, though it will be.

But the gentleman from California, knowing as he knows what totalitarianism, that scourge of the 20th century that unfortunately still remains in a few places, is all about, totalitarianism, he, perhaps more than anyone else in this hall, understands the extraordinary courage that it takes for someone who at this moment is languishing in a dungeon and whose husband is as well in another dungeon, because they are leaders of a political party in Cuba that is illegal called the 30th of November Democratic Political Party, and they ask, and they believe, and they advocate for free elections. They have two small daughters that they cannot take care of, and they are at the total mercy of the totalitarian regime, those two small daughters, because father and mother are both political prisoners.

Despite that, a few days ago Maritza Lugo, that leader of democratic Cuba, of the Cuba of the future, managed to sneak out of prison a statement. I would like to read just a part of it: From this horrible place, I come before you, the international organizations who defend human rights, defenders of democracy, justice and peace, the religious organizations, the whole world and its people, to denounce the Government of Cuba.

I accuse the dictatorial government imposed on Cuba and its repressive

arm, the State Security, of all the injustices and abuses they commit against the Cuban people, the penal population, and especially against the political prisoners of conscience. I accuse those miserable and cowardly men and women who, through the use of force, commit all types of human rights violations, while nothing stops them as they attempt to defend a false "revolution" built and maintained upon a foundation of lies and infamies.

To the dictatorial government I say, stop denying that you torture people. Stop denying international organizations access to our prisons with the pretext that you don't accept others meddling in your internal affairs.

Maritza Lugo continues, I accuse the Castro government of separating the Cuban family who, in desperation, flee Cuba for political reasons, and it goes on and on.

I ask the addressees of these lines, she states, this young woman, soon to convene in Geneva at the Human Rights Commission, to discuss Cuba, to consider the ill treatment of the Cuban people by its own government. I know that no delegation, Madam Speaker, I know that no delegation will be permitted to come visit me, Maritza Lugo says, so that they can see and corroborate this raw truth. If justice exists, however, this government, the Cuban Government, should be sanctioned for this and so many other violations that they are constantly inflicting upon the Cuban population as they deceive and laugh at the world.

And another brave woman, an economist, Martha Beatriz Roque, has just published an article, and the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) again knows the kind of ultimate courage that that takes: From within the totalitarian State, Castro's government maintains a system of economic apartheid that favors foreigners and denies Cubans basic opportunities. There exists an economic apartheid where no Cuban can invest in his country. He would have to leave and return as a foreigner. We cannot hope for development of social progress or an improvement in the standard of living while the economic repression weighs on our people and our country.

Now, despite, as Pax Christi, the organization, states and is quoted in this resolution that I commend the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) and the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) for, and the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN) and the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) so much more, despite the conspiracy of silence that has fallen over the reality of Cuba, and despite the tourists that constantly have a good time, and the economic apartheid system, not even mentioning one word of the thousands of political prisoners in the repression against the entire Nation, despite that, this Congress today is making a statement. And those people in prison in Cuba will receive this, maybe not tomorrow, maybe not next

month, but they will receive this news, and it will be extraordinarily important for them to receive the news that the American Congress, this beacon of hope for the entire world, has spoken once again. Why? Because this again, as I said, Madam Speaker, is the center of dignity and honor and of democracy for the entire world.

Yesterday at a conference going on in Havana right now, the President of something called the Inter-Parliamentary Union, approximately 1,000 members of Parliament from around the world, elected, have gone to Cuba to celebrate their conference while they party. The President of that conference was asked, is there democracy in Cuba? Her name, Najma Heptulla from India. Her answer was, The answer is yes. If we do not believe in it, then we would not have come back. Obviously, the parties, while they are being filmed must be very good. They certainly outweigh the conscience.

But the conscience of this Congress will outweigh other interests today. I am certain that the message will go out very clearly that this Congress in sovereign representation of this Nation once again stands with the oppressed Cuban people.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the remaining time.

In closing, I would like to quote directly from House Resolution 91 to indicate the importance of speaking out against these practices, and I am going to quote from two important figures from the Czech Republic and the Polish movement, two of the Republics that are helping us in passing the resolution and promoting it in Geneva next week. It reads, "President Havel, an essential figure in the Czech Republic's transition to democracy, has counseled that we thus know that by voicing open criticism of undemocratic conditions in Cuba, we encourage all the brave Cubans who endure persecution and years of prison for their loyalty to the ideals of freedom and human dignity"; and "former President Lech Walesa, leader of the Polish solidarity movement," who has urged the world to "mobilize its resources, just as was done in support of the Polish solidarity movement and the Polish workers to express their support for Cuban workers and to monitor Cuban labor rights" in Cuba.

We thank these leaders for the human rights agenda in Geneva, and we hope that our colleagues will help us in passing House Resolution 91 today.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Madam Speaker, Cuba is a totalitarian state controlled by Fidel Castro. The Government's human rights record remains a poor one. It continues to violate systematically the fundamental civil and political rights of its citizens, who do not have the right to change their government peacefully.

The Government retaliates systematically against those who seek political change. Members of the State security forces and prison officials continue to beat and otherwise abuse detainees and prisoners, neglecting them, isolating them and denying them medical treatment.

The authorities routinely threaten, arbitrarily arrest, detain, imprison and defame human rights advocates and members of independent professional associations, often with the goal of coercing them into leaving the country. The government severely restricts worker rights, including the right to form independent trade unions. It requires children to do farm work without compensation during their summer vacation.

Political prisoners are estimated at between 300 and 400 persons. Charges of disseminating enemy propaganda can bring sentences of up to 14 years. The Universal Declaration of Human Rights, international reports of human rights violations and mainstream foreign newspapers and magazines constitute enemy propaganda. The Government controls all access to the Internet, and all email messages are subject to censorship.

All media must operate under party guidelines and reflect government views. The Government attempts to shape media coverage to such a degree that it exerts pressure on domestic journalists and on foreign correspondents.

The law punishes any unauthorized assembly of more than three persons, including those for private religious services in a private home. The authorities have never approved a public meeting by a human rights group. The Government continues to restrict freedom of religion. The Government prohibits, with occasional exceptions, the construction of new churches.

Madam Speaker, these are not my words. They are not the words of the Cuban American National Foundation. They are the dispassionate words of the State Department Human Rights Report.

I'll close with two specific accounts of Cubans who suffer under Castro.

Dr. Oscar Elias Biscet, a doctor and human rights leader, was imprisoned for hanging a Cuban flag upside down. He has been beaten and, during several prolonged periods placed in punishment cells in isolation, prohibited from receiving visitors, food, clothes and books—including the Bible. This is worse even than the treatment given to Nelson Mandela as a prisoner.

Dorca Cespedes, a reporter for independent Havana Press, was told by the director of her daughter's daycare center, that the toddler could no longer attend, due to the mother's "counterrevolutionary" activities.

Dr. Biscet has been called the Martin Luther King, Jr. of Cuba.

Ms. Cespedes could be any one of us—a parent trying to make a living and raise her child in a life of truth and justice.

Madam Speaker, any even cursory reading of what's going on in Cuba today tells us that we've seen this totalitarianism before. We've seen it for decades in Cuba, just as we saw it for decades in the former Soviet bloc.

Madam Speaker, let us today recall our support for human rights and democracy in the former Soviet Union and Eastern Europe, and let us pledge, by agreeing to this resolution, the same support for Cubans endeavoring to seek truth and break free.

Whatever a member feels about our policy towards Cuba with regard to the economic sanctions, there is no excuse for not agreeing to this resolution condemning the human rights practices of Cuba's government.

I thank the gentleman from New Jersey for bringing it before us; I am proud to be an

original cosponsor of the resolution; and I urge its unanimous adoption today by the House.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, House Resolution 91.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds of those present have voted in the affirmative.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

URGING INTRODUCTION OF U.N. RESOLUTION CALLING UPON THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA TO END ITS HUMAN RIGHTS VIOLATIONS IN CHINA AND TIBET

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 56) urging the appropriate representative of the United States to the United Nations Commission on Human Rights to introduce at the annual meeting of the Commission a resolution calling upon the People's Republic of China to end its human rights violations in China and Tibet, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 56

Whereas the annual meeting of the United Nations Commission on Human Rights in Geneva, Switzerland, provides a forum for discussing human rights and expressing international support for improved human rights performance;

Whereas, according to the Department of State and international human rights organizations, the Government of the People's Republic of China continues to commit widespread and well-documented human rights abuses in China and Tibet;

Whereas the People's Republic of China has yet to demonstrate its willingness to abide by internationally accepted norms of freedom of belief, expression, and association by repealing or amending laws and decrees that restrict those freedoms;

Whereas the Government of the People's Republic of China continues to ban and criminalize groups it labels as cults or heretical organizations;

Whereas the Government of the People's Republic of China has repressed unregistered religious congregations and spiritual movements, including Falun Gong, and persists in persecuting persons on the basis of unauthorized religious activities using such measures as harassment, prolonged detention, physical abuse, incarceration, and closure or destruction of places of worship;

Whereas authorities in the People's Republic of China have continued their efforts to extinguish expressions of protest or criticism, have detained scores of citizens associated with attempts to organize a peaceful opposition, to expose corruption, to preserve

their ethnic minority identity, or to use the Internet for the free exchange of ideas, and have sentenced many citizens so detained to harsh prison terms;

Whereas Chinese authorities continue to exert control over religious and cultural institutions in Tibet, abusing human rights through instances of torture, arbitrary arrest, and detention of Tibetans without public trial for peacefully expressing their political or religious views;

Whereas bilateral human rights dialogues between several nations and the People's Republic of China have yet to produce substantial adherence to international norms; and

Whereas the People's Republic of China has signed the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, but has yet to take the steps necessary to make the treaty legally binding: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) strongly supports the decision of the United States Government to offer and solicit cosponsorship for a resolution at the 57th Session of the United Nations Human Rights Commission in Geneva, Switzerland, calling upon the Government of the People's Republic of China to end its human rights abuses in China and Tibet, in compliance with its international obligations; and

(2) urges the United States Government to take the lead in organizing multilateral support to obtain passage by the Commission of such resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) and the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN).

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the resolution now under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, as a cosponsor of House Resolution 56, I rise in support of the manager's amendment and urge my colleagues to vote in favor of this important resolution, which urges the passage of a U.S.-sponsored resolution at the U.N. Commission on Human Rights which calls upon the Chinese Government to end its human rights violations in China and Tibet.

During committee consideration, the chairman requested unanimous consent that the Chair be authorized to seek consideration of House Resolution 56 on the House suspension calendar.

□ 1530

No objection was heard. The manager's amendment includes an amendment by the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) updating the resolution to reflect the fact that the Bush administration has introduced a resolution at the Human Rights Commission

in Geneva concerning the deplorable human rights condition in the People's Republic of China. The title will be amended to reflect the modifications made by the manager's amendment.

This resolution is a statement of fact outlining that China is an authoritarian state which continues to systematically violate the human rights of everyone, and the civil and political liberties of all of its citizens. State security personnel are responsible for numerous abuses, such as political and other extrajudicial killings, lengthy incommunicado detentions, and the use of torture.

National, racial, and ethnic minorities remain subject to intense persecution and discrimination. The authorities frequently launch campaigns to crack down on opposition and pro-democracy groups. Freedom of movement, speech, assembly, and association are severely restricted. The controls on religious worship have intensified, with harassment of church leaders and other faithful, including fines, detentions, physical abuse, and torture. Many houses of worship have been destroyed.

Trafficking in persons, mainly women and children, for forced prostitution or illegal forced labor continues, placing this segment of the population in constant risk of slavery.

Recently, we have seen how their blatant disregard for the universal rights and liberties of human beings extends to foreign visitors, as reflected by the detention of academics by the Chinese regime. Dr. Xu Zerong, a Ph.D. from Oxford University, was detained last fall; and to date the Chinese authorities have not offered any explanation for his continued detention. His family still does not know where he is being held.

Professor Li Shaomin, a U.S. citizen who teaches business at the City University of Hong Kong, was arrested on February 25. The Chinese have yet to present any information regarding charges against him.

There is the case of Dr. Gao Zhan, a research scholar based at American University, detained last month by Chinese authorities.

Just today, Human Rights Watch's Academic Freedom Committee sent the letter to the Chinese leader to protest these detentions, and calling on the Chinese leadership to follow internationally recognized standards of due process to protect the lives and the rights of these scholars.

Further, there is the grim situation that the U.S. is facing of protecting and securing the safe return of 25 Americans being held hostage by the PRC. This picture paints a profound and widespread violation of internationally recognized human rights norms.

The People's Republic of China must be held accountable for its action. Constant pressure from the U.S. and the international community is vital if any improvements are to take place in

China. The resolutions before us are an important part of that strategy.

I am proud that the Bush administration has rejected the view that Beijing is our strategic partner and considers passage of the China human rights resolution one of its top priorities in Geneva.

As the U.S. delegation works to ensure debate on human rights conditions in China and to secure the votes for a resolution calling on China to end its terrible human rights practices, let us show them our full support by voting in favor of the manager's amendment to House Resolution 56.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LANTOS. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of this resolution. It was with sincere sadness that I introduced this resolution a month ago, and that I now ask my colleagues to strongly support this resolution.

When I introduced this resolution, Madam Speaker, 24 American airmen were not held captive on a Chinese island, contrary to all provisions of international law, and it is a sheer coincidence that we are considering this resolution at the very time when the attention of the United States and, indeed, much of the world is directed at Beijing to see how they will function in this self-induced and self-created crisis.

When I introduced my resolution a month ago, as all Americans, I also was hoping optimistically that the Chinese government would take at least a few minimal steps to improve the abominable human rights record of the People's Republic of China. Unfortunately, the State Department's Human Rights Report indicates that the human rights situation in China this past year has become worse.

As the report demonstrates, the government of China continues to use torture, forced confessions, arbitrary arrest and detention, and the general denial of due process. The government of China restricts freedom of speech. It restricts the freedom of the press. It denies freedom of religion, including the most brutal crackdown on the Falun Gong spiritual movement, Tibetan Buddhists, Muslims, and, of course, Christians.

The Chinese government continues to subject vast numbers of political prisoners to forced labor, and it prevents the formation of independent trade unions or independent nongovernmental organizations.

The resolution before the House today indicates strong support for the decision of our administration to offer a resolution at the Human Rights Commission in Geneva calling on the Chinese government to end its human rights abuses, both in China and in Tibet.

In the past, Congress has passed similar resolutions, but unfortunately, the Chinese government usually prevails in

Geneva on a so-called no-action motion. Under this devious parliamentary tactic, the Chinese government successfully prevents even the consideration of our resolution.

The Chinese prevail in this vote not because the international community recognizes its performance in the human rights field, but because the Chinese government systematically threatens commercial contracts with the developed world and threatens to deny foreign aid to poor nations.

I am under no illusion, Madam Speaker, that it will be anything but an uphill battle to prevail in Geneva this year and to win passage of the China human rights resolution.

I commend the President and the Secretary of State, Colin Powell, for moving forward with this effort. I will do whatever I can to urge other governments to support our effort.

In all candor, let me state, Madam Speaker, that I am particularly disappointed in the countries of the European Union as they continue to shirk their responsibilities to promote internationally recognized human rights. The European Union ministers have already announced that they will not co-sponsor the American resolution.

Ultimately, some of them will vote with us, but it is a shame that the Europeans continue to bury their heads in the sand, desperately hoping that trade with China will magically bring about the creation of a Chinese civil society based on internationally recognized human rights.

I would like to take just one specific example of the intensity and flavor of human rights violations in China. Recently, Madam Speaker, as we know, the Chinese government imprisoned an American University researcher, Gao Zhan, and her family on the phony charge of espionage. Now, Gao Zhan is an academic who has conducted research related to the status of women. She and her husband are permanent residents of the United States, and their son, Andrew, 5 years old, is an American citizen.

Gao and her family had gone to China to visit her family. They were standing in line at the Beijing airport preparing to get on the plane to come back to their home in the United States. Out of nowhere, Chinese officials emerged and pulled all three family members out of line and hustled them into separate cars.

Gao was put in prison, we do not know where. As of today, her whereabouts are unknown. Her husband was blindfolded and driven 2 hours to an unknown location, and their 5-year-old son was taken to a government facility, even though his grandparents live in the city, where they happened to be.

One of my grandchildren is 5 years old. I can imagine the fear and the horror and the pain and the nightmare a 5-year-old must go through as out of the blue his mother and father are arrested, taken to separate government police cars, and taken away. This little

boy for 26 days, 26 consecutive days, did not see his mother, his father, or his grandparents.

This degree of insensitivity to fundamental human rights of a little 5-year-old child is an index of the degree to which the Chinese government respects human rights today.

I strongly urge my colleagues to support this resolution. There is nothing I would like to see more than good relations with China. I have the highest regard for the Chinese people. They represent one of the great civilizations on the face of this planet. They have all the opportunity of building an advanced, civilized society, but they must not do it by trampling on the human rights of their citizens, or on the fundamental human rights of a little 5-year-old American citizen who was deprived for 26 days from contact with his family.

Madam Speaker, I ask my colleagues to support this resolution, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN), the chairman emeritus of our committee.

(Mr. GILMAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GILMAN. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding time to me.

Madam Speaker, I am pleased to rise in strong support of this resolution, House Resolution 56, a resolution urging our Nation's representative to the U.N. Commission on Human Rights to move ahead with this resolution at the annual meeting of the Commission in Geneva, a resolution calling upon the People's Republic of China to end its human rights violations in China and in Tibet.

I commend our ranking minority member, the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS), for crafting this resolution. I thank our chairwoman, the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN), for swiftly bringing it to the floor at this time.

Recently, Madam Speaker, our State Department announced it is going to introduce such a resolution. On February 26, the same day its Human Rights Report was released, the State Department spokesman, Phillip Reeker, said the U.S. decision to go forward with the resolution is based upon the fact that the Chinese government's abysmal human rights record has continued to deteriorate over the past year.

We commend the administration for this decision. Regrettably, Beijing has managed year after year to muzzle the Human Rights Commission by passing a no-action motion on similar resolutions. Accordingly, there is usually no debate on the resolution, and as a result, it almost never comes up for a vote before the Commission.

Unless the international community, our Nation included, finally manages

to take a strong stand against Beijing's abuses of human rights, then its leaders will only become more emboldened to take further repressive action against Christians, against Buddhists, Muslims, and other religious groups within that Nation.

Past failure to condemn China has undoubtedly led to the severe crack-down against Christian house churches, against Buddhists in Tibet, Muslims in east Turkistan, and millions of Chinese Falun Gong followers.

□ 1545

Madam Speaker, I am particularly concerned that Beijing has continued to stonewall any possible meeting with His Holiness, the Dalai Lama; and unless they reach out and grasp the olive branch that His Holiness offers, the regional instability will continue to grow worse.

Accordingly, I urge my colleagues to fully support this resolution, and I thank the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) for yielding the time to me.

Mr. LANTOS. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Washington (Mr. McDERMOTT), my good friend.

Mr. McDERMOTT. Madam Speaker, I have great respect for my colleagues here on the floor who have put this resolution forward. However, I seriously question the decision to bring this bill to the House for debate today.

I know the decision was made last week. It was made before the events of the weekend have occurred, and it seems to me that in choosing to bring such a resolution to the floor at a time when the Chinese Government is holding 24 American servicemen in Hainan incommunicado even after repeated requests by our embassy to visit with them is an unnecessary step for us to be taking.

Madam Speaker, I called the White House today and asked them what position they had on this resolution; they do not have one. I do not know what that says about the 24 people from the State of Washington who are being held in Hainan Island.

It is not that I am unsympathetic with this bill. I have traveled to Dharmasala. I talked to the Dalai Lama in his own place. I have discussed with him at length the Tibetan problems.

I visited Nepal and talked with refugees from Chinese rule there. I have many of them living in my own city. And I do not come frivolously to this floor to discuss this issue, but I do believe that we could easily postpone it until we have resolved whatever is happening on Hainan.

I think we have American diplomats even at this moment negotiating for the release of the crew of the EP-3 and trying to get negotiations started for the freedom of those servicemen; and either we believe this resolution means something and therefore will have an impact, and I think most of us who

have traveled abroad have seen the impact of resolutions on the floor of the House in the newspapers and on television of other countries, or you do not believe this resolution has any impact at all, and I think we must consider very carefully what the impact of this kind of a resolution is when we are going to be back here in a couple of weeks and we could deal with it.

Madam Speaker, I understand the conference is on now, but I really think that we have to think long and hard about timing. The timing was not one we made, and I am not blaming anybody here for choosing to put it up today. I would be supporting it wholeheartedly if I did not know what had gone on this weekend.

I think for that reason we ought to consider seriously whether or not we want to go forward with this.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Madam Speaker, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH), the vice chairman of our Committee on International Relations.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN), my good friend, for yielding the time to me.

Madam Speaker, I want to congratulate the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) on his sponsorship of this very important resolution.

I am very proud to be one of the cosponsors, and I want to thank the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) the distinguished and effective chair of the International Operations and Human Rights Committee for her work and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE) the Chairman of the Full Committee for moving this legislation to the floor.

I would just say to the previous speaker, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. McDERMOTT), that this resolution simply tells the truth, and it seems to me that truth-telling should always be in season; but there is also the timeliness issue. The U.N. Human Rights Commission is currently meeting in Geneva, and Members should be aware that decisions are being made by various delegations and by various diplomats right now.

A postponement of this resolution could mean the loss of a vote or two from delegates who might think that we are ducking the issue or having second thoughts that perhaps we are not as serious as we have said we are. Of course nothing could be further from the truth. We are indeed very, very serious.

Time is not on our side. There is only a few weeks left for deliberations by the U.N. Commission on human rights.

Madam Speaker, I have been there. I lobbied delegations on behalf of human rights in the past. We need to send this message right now that we are very serious about human rights in China. No if, ands or buts, about it!

Madam Speaker, just let me say that the new tension created by the holding

of 24 American servicemen by the People's Republic of China—a crisis situation that all of us want to see resolved immediately—only underscores anew how the policies of the Beijing dictatorship are harsh and unreasonable and how those policies have continued to worsen and to deteriorate with each and every passing year.

Sadly, universally recognized norms and international laws have no meaningful application to the dictatorship. The dictatorship in Beijing mocks the rule of law.

Madam Speaker, any honest assessment of China's record on human rights makes it abundantly clear that the leaders who rule China with an iron fist have no respect whatsoever for human life, especially the lives of their own citizens, especially the lives of women and children.

Madam Speaker, forced abortion is an unspeakable cruelty to women and babies, and was properly construed to be a crime against humanity at the Nuremberg War Crimes tribunals when the Nazis were held to account. Today, the crime of forced abortion in China is pervasive, it is systematic, and it is common place.

Forced abortion in China is state-sponsored violence against women and children. As I think many Members know, as a means of enforcing what they call their one-child-per-couple policy, first announced back in 1979, the Chinese Government routinely coerces mothers in China, to have abortions often late in pregnancy or to undergo forced sterilization or mandatory birth control.

Over the past decade, Madam Speaker, I have led three human rights trips to China. I have met with Li Peng. The gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) and I raised human rights issues; face to face he just dismissed it out of hand as if it was all exaggerated and fabricated. There was no engagement—constructive or otherwise.

I have chaired over 18 hearings and markups on legislation pertaining to Chinese human rights abuses; and in the 1980s and the 1990s, I and many others in this Chamber have repeatedly spoken out against forced abortion and forced sterilization in China as well as other egregious abuses.

To my shock and to my dismay, many family planning organizations like Planned Parenthood have decided to either look the other way, as millions of Chinese women are cruelly forced to undergo abortion, or in the case of the U.N. Population Fund to aggressively defend it, to whitewash these abuses as “nonexistent” or as the “exception”, rather than the rule.

Madam Speaker, at one of my hearings we heard from a woman by the name of Mrs. Gao. Mrs. Gao ran one of the family planning programs in Fukien Province. She made the point that during the course the decade that she ran the program, they literally would take women and put them or their relatives behind bars until they acceded to the so-called “voluntary” abortion.

She finally summed up her testimony by saying, by day, I was a monster; by night, a wife and mother.

It seems to me, Madam Speaker, that the Chinese Population Control Program is a “monster”—a monstrous abuse of women; and the indifference of both the East and the West makes us, however unwittingly, complicit in these crimes.

Madam Speaker, just let me say that I encourage Members to read the country reports on human rights practices, all 59 pages dedicated to what is going on in the People's Republic of China. That report is very accurate; and it makes the point in the declarative sentence near the beginning and I quote,

The government's poor human rights record worsened, and it continued to commit numerous serious abuses. The government intensified crackdowns on religion and in Tibet, intensified its harsh treatment of political dissent and suppressed any person or group perceived to be a threat to the government.

The State Department report goes on to say that by the end of the year 2000, and I quote,

Thousands of unregistered religious institutions have either been closed or destroyed, and hundreds of Falun Gong leaders have been imprisoned, thousands have been sent to the lao gai, or mental institutions.

The report notes, and I think Members need to take note of this, that more than 100 Falun Gong practitioners were tortured to death in Chinese prisons. Death by torture is often a long, exceedingly painful ordeal. It does not happen overnight. After daily beatings and deprivations of food and sleep, finally the victim succumbs to death as a result of those beatings and abuse.

Madam Speaker, the United Nations has documented and numerous human rights groups like Human Rights Watch and Amnesty and, of course, our own Country Reports on Human Rights Practices that torture is endemic in China. If you are arrested as a political prisoner, a religious dissenter or even a common criminal, they beat you black and blue, sometimes to death. That is the reality of what is going on in the People's Republic of China.

Let me just finally say something about truth-telling. Some years back, President Clinton invited Chu Haotien to the United States—the Butcher of Beijing, the man who literally ordered the crackdown on the students at Tiananmen Square, and said, go and bayonet and kill and maim and hunt down those individuals.

After he was invited here, he was at the U.S. War College and gave a speech and made the outrageous claim—a big lie—that no one died at Tiananmen Square.

My staff and I quickly put together a hearing and invited eyewitnesses to that massacre; and we invited Chu Haotien to come and testify, or anyone else from the Chinese Government, including Ambassador Li. We had an empty chair because nobody showed up.

We heard from an editor from the People's Daily in China, who accurately reported on the killing—and paid a big price—and we heard from a Time Magazine correspondent and a host of others, others who gave witness to the big lie uttered by General Chu.

I see I'm out of time—I have so much more to say. Suffice to say, this resolution puts us on record in favor of the oppressed, and the persecuted, and encourages the Bush administration to continue its work on behalf of human rights.

Mr. LANTOS. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I want to thank all of my colleagues on the other side for their eloquent and strong support.

I would like to comment briefly on the observation of the gentleman from Washington (Mr. McDERMOTT) about timing. I have the highest regard for my colleague from Washington, and his statement was a carefully thought through and serious one.

Upon reflection, it seems to me that it would be unconscionable for this body not to deal with the issue of human rights violations in China as the U.N. Commission is dealing with the question of whether or not to support this resolution.

It will be interesting to see whether the Chinese Government will add to the human rights violations of its own people, human rights violations of 26 American servicemen. I hope and pray that they will not, but it would be singularly unacceptable to be intimidated by the current situation on that island.

The Chinese are illegally holding 26 American servicemen. This is a fact. It is also a fact that millions of Chinese are deprived day in and day out of their fundamental human rights, and this body will have to speak out on that subject.

Madam Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE), one of the strongest champions of human rights in this body.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) for his unending commitment and as well to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) and the other speakers that have spoken here.

This is a time, Madam Speaker, that one might pause and offer to tread lightly. We do know that there are American citizens, military personnel, our men and women, who have offered themselves for our freedom now held incognito, without opportunity to speak in China. I respect that and would want to be cautious in saying to this body that we are respectful of the negotiations, and we want our loved ones, our Americans, the Americans that are held illegally and against all international agreements, back immediately.

At the same time, I thank the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS)

for recognizing that as we speak, the U.N. conference is being held, and we would be shamed if our voices were silent.

I come wearing a particularly difficult hat, because I was convinced about 6 months ago to vote for the PNTR. I spoke with President Carter who spoke about the energy and democracy that was occurring in the villages. I was excited about that.

I spoke with many others who felt that if you opened the doors of dialogue and communication that we would bring to China the sense of the world ownership or membership, if you will, owning into the world's desire for opportunities for all of the world's people.

Madam Speaker, I was very troubled by the debate in PNTR, because the human rights issues were of great concern. At that time the Falun Gong attacks were continuing. Suicides in the squares were going on. People were mutilating themselves or burning themselves out of protest.

□ 1600

But yet there was this discussion that religion was rising in enthusiasm and that we should give China the opportunity.

I am somewhat saddened that we now speak in the month of April 2001 and that we can list a litany of infractions or violations, more so for people who are incarcerated, it is their life, that we see ongoing in China.

During the debate, it was said that China does not move as fast as the world does; that we do not understand its culture; that we have to understand what its place is in the world. And, frankly, some of that was appealing or attractive. Yet we find ourselves today longing for China to have made the commitment that we wished it had made and had turned the corner on some of the acceptance of the various religious groups and as well the right to be free.

As the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) knows, because I spoke to him earlier today, I am so struck by the words of Gao Zhan's husband, the professor who is now held in China, along with many other academicians. It is well known that she has gone to China on many occasions visiting her family. It is well known that her lawyer says she is not a spy. Her husband just received his citizenship. She was separated from her husband some 26 or so days. She is being held.

How can any one of us not be frightened and appalled and outraged about the family separation, even while they were in China, to the extent that the 5-year-old boy was separated from his father and his mother, and still today remains without a mother. This seems to be an incident that was not provoked, that China did not have to engage in. The family was on their way out of the country; not in the country, trying to get in.

What merciful reason, what reason can they give to explain the stopping of

this family at that time? What reason can they give for not stopping them and questioning them and releasing them? Absolutely none.

So I rise to support this resolution because I hope as the proceedings are going on, there will be a vote that expresses the United States' outrage of China's behavior.

Madam Speaker, we will offer a bill tomorrow to give Gao the citizenship that she deserves, because we believe that the voices of reason are not being heard in China, and that they continuously renounce, reject the hand of friendship, the hand of peace, the hand of understanding that many of us have tried to give in the United States Congress.

I applaud the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) for his leadership on this legislation, and my prayers go out to the men and women that are detained, both Chinese and American, and to their families I say that we will work every day to secure their safe return.

Madam Speaker, I rise in very strong support of H. Res. 96, Direct U.S. To Condemn Chinese Human Rights Violations. This resolution says that China cannot suppress religious and cultural institutions and expect to pursue the economic reforms it must pursue for its development and prosperity. As Victor Hugo wrote in 1887, "An invasion of armies can be resisted; an invasion of ideas cannot be resisted."

According to the U.S. State Department and international human rights organizations, the Chinese government continues to commit widespread and well-documented human rights abuses in China and Tibet. They also say China has yet to demonstrate its willingness to abide by internationally accepted norms of freedom of belief, expression, and association by repealing or amending laws that restrict those freedoms. Finally, China continues to ban and criminalize groups that it labels as cults or heretical organizations, such as Falun Gong. Practitioners of Falun Gong are persecuted for no reason other than being well organized as a religious group in China.

This resolution expresses the sense of the House that at the upcoming annual session of the U.N. Human Rights Commission in Geneva, the United States should solicit cosponsorship for a resolution calling upon the Chinese government to end its human rights abuse in Cuba and Tibet, in compliance with its international organization; and that the U.S. government should take the lead in organizing multilateral support to obtain passage by the commission of such a resolution.

This measure states that Chinese authorities have committed to suppress protest criticism. The Chinese leadership is plainly uncomfortable with organized dissent. Furthermore, H. Res. 56 states that Chinese citizens have been detained for peaceful opposition, attempting to expose corruption, trying to preserve ethnic minorities and using the Internet.

H. Res. 56 makes clear that China continues—with impunity—to exert control over religious and cultural institutions in Tibet, abusing human rights through instances of torture, arbitrary arrests and detentions of Tibetans, without public trials, for peacefully expressing their political or religious views; that

bilateral talks with several nations and China have yet to produce substantial adherence to international norms; and that China has signed the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights but has yet to take the steps necessary to make the treaty legally binding.

Despite the recent crackdown against religious and cultural institutions in China, some progress has been made through a commitment to normalize relations between our nations. But we must be vigilant, nevertheless, in speaking out for those who cannot speak. Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of the resolution.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DIAZ-BALART), who will be in Geneva carrying forth the message of the United States for freedom for the Chinese people.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) for yielding me this time.

With regard to some confusion that may have arisen based on some comments made previously from the other side of the aisle, I wish to say that it is the Bush administration, Madam Speaker, which has demonstrated their possession of the dignity as well as the vision to introduce precisely the resolution in Geneva that this resolution before us today is in support of.

The regime in mainland China is a brutal, totalitarian, cowardly, rogue regime that tortures men and women due to their religious and political beliefs. It is a regime that brutally forces abortion on its women once they have met Orwellian quotas of birth control. The least that we can do in this Congress today to be true to the values, beliefs, and aspirations that gave birth to these United States of America is to support this resolution.

Mr. LANTOS. Madam Speaker, I do not believe we have any additional speakers, but I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. KIRK), a longtime staffer of the Committee on International Relations and now a Member of our institution.

Mr. KIRK. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me this time.

Madam Speaker, China is a powerful nation, but not yet a great nation. Powerful nations muster armies and command territory, but great nations lead mankind and advance human values. China stands on the brink of being either powerful or great, and the events of the recent days disappoint us all and keep China from her own potential.

With regard to the Hainan incident, I speak as a Naval Reserve officer and call on China to return our servicemen and women. Our aircraft was in international waters, unarmed and a danger to no one. China is a party to the Incidents-at-Sea Treaty, an agreement she signed but does not appear to abide by. China must return our servicemen and

women and the aircraft and end this incident now.

A nation like China is measured by how its treats people of different languages and religions. China's record on Tibet is disappointingly clear, and in human rights in general one of abuse and imprisonment for prisoners of conscience. Li Shaomin, recognized in China as a key leader, was jailed for sending e-news to her husband; Gao Zhan was detained February 11, along with her 5-year-old American son; Xu Zerong, an academician, was jailed last fall and still is held incommunicado; and Rabiya Kadir was jailed March 10 for giving her husband newspaper articles.

Children in Tibet today are taught that religion is backward behavior. Nuns and monks make up 74 percent of China's political prisoners, and China regularly jams Radio Free Asia broadcasts designed to keep people informed. We must speak out.

Chun-gua, China, and Mai-gua, the United States, can live in peace and become friends, but this depends on China adhering to international agreements like the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the Incidents-at-Sea agreements, both agreements China signed, and shared values.

Mr. LANTOS. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

This was an eloquent debate, Madam Speaker, and I want to thank all my colleagues. The American people stand united in demanding that our servicemen be released unconditionally and immediately, and we are calling on China to improve its human rights record.

Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

To close, Madam Speaker, I would like to remind my colleagues that the State Department has given us vote counts and cost sheets. They have come up to the Hill to ensure congressional support and help for the Bush administration's priorities in Geneva. When we talk to the State Department officials, they tell us what their directives have been from the President and the White House. We have been meeting with them for the last 3 months, and they clearly stated that the Secretary of State and the White House ask for daily briefings on the status of the China resolution in Geneva.

Madam Speaker, if Congress does not speak today by voting in favor of the resolution before us, House Resolution 56, the Chinese regime will be able to prevent any discussion on its human rights record in Geneva. Year after year they intimidate members of the Human Rights Commission for a vote of no action on China, silencing the dissidents and the opposition further, removing one critical vehicle for the voices of the oppressed to be tortured in China, and they must be heard.

Again, without U.S. leadership and the full weight of our U.S. Congress behind this resolution and behind the democratic forces in China, the PRC will once again manipulate the U.N. Commission on Human Rights in Geneva to continue its reign of subjugation and terror over the Chinese people.

Let us force the PRC to abide by the covenants and the declarations it has signed. We must stand firm in the face of Chinese aggression against its own people, against foreign visitors and against American citizens.

Madam Speaker, I ask my colleagues to please vote "yes" on the resolution before us.

Madam Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong support of House Resolution 56, urging the appropriate representative of the United States to the United Nations Commission on Human Rights to introduce at the annual meeting of the Commission a resolution calling upon the People's Republic of China to end its human rights violations in China and Tibet.

Tibet is a country and culture that has garnered international attention in the past several decades. Since 1959, China has implemented a relentless policy and program to erase Tibet from history and existence. The former religious leader of Tibet, the Dalai Lama, was forced to leave Tibet, and now lives in exile in India. There are many other Tibetans who chose to follow him and thus, remain in exile today.

I am particularly concerned with China's human rights record with respect to Tibet, such as repression of freedom of speech, religion, and expression. The Chinese government's policy of suppressing religious, political, and cultural freedom in Tibet is highly disturbing.

I am deeply troubled that monks and nuns make up seventy-four percent of over 250 political prisoners incarcerated in Tibet. While there has been a slight decline in new detentions since 1997 in Tibet, this may be attributed to the implementation and intensification of the Patriotic Education campaign, which requires monks, nuns, and lay persons to denounce the Dalai Lama. However, the number of monks and nuns known to have been detained as a result of opposing the Patriotic Education campaign is a small fraction of those who have been expelled from their monasteries or who have fled from Tibet.

Recently, it has come to my attention that Chinese authorities have increased the jamming of foreign radio broadcasts in Tibet following the allocation of increased resources by Beijing in an attempt to prevent "infiltration" of the airwaves by "foreign hostile forces." It is my understanding that Voice of America, Radio Free Asia and Voice of Tibet, which all cover both international news and news of the activities of the Dalai Lama and the Tibetan community in exile, have encountered intensified jamming of their broadcasts into Tibetan areas over the past four to six months. The Chinese authorities have also announced an expansion of state-run Tibetan language broadcasting, including the training of more Tibetan journalists and new programs in Kham and Amdo dialects, in order to counter foreign

radio broadcasters. It is my belief that this intensified focus to jam such broadcasts is a result of the Chinese government's recent emphasis on propaganda work in Tibet, an important element of Beijing's campaign to develop the western regions of China.

The United States has a moral obligation to pursue strong diplomatic pressures which assert an end to civil persecutions not only in Tibet but all countries where individual liberties are routinely repressed. I join by colleagues in voicing every American's opposition to these atrocities and acts of repression.

I commend Congressman FRANK WOLF from Virginia for his leadership in bringing attention to the plight of the Tibetan people and Tibetan culture, and I urge my colleagues from both sides of the aisle to support this important resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHAYS). The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 56, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds of those present have voted in the affirmative.

Mr. LANTOS. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

SMALL BUSINESS INTEREST CHECKING ACT OF 2001

Mr. OXLEY. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 974) to increase the number of interaccount transfers which may be made from business accounts at depository institutions, to authorize the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System to pay interest on reserves, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 974

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Small Business Interest Checking Act of 2001".

SEC. 2. INTEREST-BEARING TRANSACTION ACCOUNTS AUTHORIZED.

(a) REPEAL OF PROHIBITION ON PAYMENT OF INTEREST ON DEMAND DEPOSITS.—

(1) FEDERAL RESERVE ACT.—Section 19(i) of the Federal Reserve Act (12 U.S.C. 371a) is amended to read as follows:

"(i) [Repealed]".

(2) HOME OWNERS' LOAN ACT.—The first sentence of section 5(b)(1)(B) of the Home Owners' Loan Act (12 U.S.C. 1464(b)(1)(B)) is amended by striking "savings association may not—" and all that follows through "(ii) permit any" and inserting "savings association may not permit any".

(3) FEDERAL DEPOSIT INSURANCE ACT.—Section 18(g) of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1828(g)) is amended to read as follows:

"(g) [Repealed]".

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by subsection (a) shall take effect at the end of the 2-year period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 3. INTEREST-BEARING TRANSACTION ACCOUNTS AUTHORIZED FOR ALL BUSINESSES.

Section 2 of Public Law 93-100 (12 U.S.C. 1832) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

"(3) EXCEPTION FROM PARAGRAPH (2) LIMITATION.—Paragraph (2) shall not apply to any depository institution which is prohibited by the applicable law of its chartering State from offering demand deposits and either—

"(A) does not engage in any lending activities; or

"(B) is not an affiliate of any company or companies with assets that, in the aggregate, represent more than 10 percent of the total assets of the depository institution.";

(2) by redesignating subsections (b) and (c) as subsections (c) and (d), respectively; and

(3) by inserting after subsection (a) the following:

"(b) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, any depository institution may permit the owner of any deposit or account which is a deposit or account on which interest or dividends are paid and is not a deposit or account described in subsection (a)(2) to make up to 24 transfers per month (or such greater number as the Board may determine by rule or order), for any purpose, to another account of the owner in the same institution. Nothing in this subsection shall be construed to prevent an account offered pursuant to this subsection from being considered a transaction account (as defined in section 19(b) of the Federal Reserve Act for purposes of such Act)."

SEC. 4. PAYMENT OF INTEREST ON RESERVES AT FEDERAL RESERVE BANKS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 19(b) of the Federal Reserve Act (12 U.S.C. 461(b)) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

"(12) EARNINGS ON RESERVES.—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—Balances maintained at a Federal reserve bank by or on behalf of a depository institution may receive earnings to be paid by the Federal reserve bank at least once each calendar quarter at a rate or rates not to exceed the general level of short-term interest rates.

"(B) REGULATIONS RELATING TO PAYMENTS AND DISTRIBUTION.—The Board may prescribe regulations concerning—

"(i) the payment of earnings in accordance with this paragraph;

"(ii) the distribution of such earnings to the depository institutions which maintain balances at such banks or on whose behalf such balances are maintained; and

"(iii) the responsibilities of depository institutions, Federal home loan banks, and the National Credit Union Administration Central Liquidity Facility with respect to the crediting and distribution of earnings attributable to balances maintained, in accordance with subsection (c)(1)(B), in a Federal reserve bank by any such entity on behalf of depository institutions.".

(b) AUTHORIZATION FOR PASS THROUGH RESERVES FOR MEMBER BANKS.—Section 19(c)(1)(B) of the Federal Reserve Act (12 U.S.C. 461(c)(1)(B)) is amended by striking "which is not a member bank".

(c) SURVEY OF BANK FEES AND SERVICES.—Section 19 of the Federal Reserve Act (as amended by subsections (a) and (b) of this section) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

"(n) SURVEY OF BANK FEES AND SERVICES.—

"(1) ANNUAL SURVEY REQUIRED.—The Board shall obtain annually a sample, which is representative by type and size of the institu-

tion and geographic location, of the following retail banking services and products provided by insured depository institutions and insured credit unions (along with related fees and minimum balances):

"(A) Checking and other transaction accounts.

"(B) Negotiable order of withdrawal and savings accounts.

"(C) Automated teller machine transactions.

"(D) Other electronic transactions.

"(E) Credit Cards.

"(2) MINIMUM SURVEY REQUIREMENT.—The annual survey described in paragraph (1) shall meet the following minimum requirements:

"(A) CHECKING AND OTHER TRANSACTION ACCOUNTS.—Data on checking and transaction accounts shall include, at a minimum, the following:

"(i) Monthly and annual fees and minimum balances to avoid such fees.

"(ii) Minimum opening balances.

"(iii) Check processing fees.

"(iv) Check printing fees.

"(v) Balance inquiry fees.

"(vi) Fees imposed for using a teller or other institution employee.

"(vii) Stop payment order fees.

"(viii) Nonsufficient fund fees.

"(ix) Overdraft fees.

"(x) Deposit items returned fees.

"(xi) Availability of no-cost or low-cost accounts for consumers who maintain low balances.

"(B) NEGOTIABLE ORDER OF WITHDRAWAL ACCOUNTS AND SAVINGS ACCOUNTS.—Data on negotiable order of withdrawal accounts and savings accounts shall include, at a minimum, the following:

"(i) Monthly and annual fees and minimum balances to avoid such fees.

"(ii) Minimum opening balances.

"(iii) Rate at which interest is paid to consumers.

"(iv) Check processing fees for negotiable order of withdrawal accounts.

"(v) Check printing fees for negotiable order of withdrawal accounts.

"(vi) Balance inquiry fees.

"(vii) Fees imposed for using a teller or other institution employee.

"(viii) Stop payment order fees for negotiable order of withdrawal accounts.

"(ix) Nonsufficient fund fees for negotiable order of withdrawal accounts.

"(x) Overdraft fees for negotiable order of withdrawal accounts.

"(xi) Deposit items returned fees.

"(xii) Availability of no-cost or low-cost accounts for consumers who maintain low balances.

"(C) AUTOMATED TELLER TRANSACTIONS.—Data on automated teller machine transactions shall include, at a minimum, the following:

"(i) Annual and monthly fees.

"(ii) Card fees.

"(iii) Fees charged to customers for withdrawals, deposits, transfers between accounts, balance inquiries through institution-owned machines.

"(iv) Fees charged to customers for withdrawals, deposits, transfers between accounts, balance inquiries through machines owned by others.

"(v) Fees charged to noncustomers for withdrawals, deposits, transfers between accounts, balance inquiries through institution-owned machines.

"(vi) Point-of-sale transaction fees.

"(vii) Surcharges.

"(D) OTHER ELECTRONIC TRANSACTIONS.—Data on other electronic transactions shall include, at a minimum, the following:

"(i) Wire transfer fees.

“(ii) Fees related to payments made over the Internet or through other electronic means.

“(E) CREDIT CARD CHARGES AND FEES.—Data related to credit cards shall include, at a minimum, the following:

“(i) Application fees.

“(ii) Annual and monthly fees.

“(iii) Rates of interest charged for purchases and cash advances, when an account is not in default.

“(iv) Rates of interest charged for purchases and cash advances, when an account is in default.

“(v) Average annual finance charges paid by customers.

“(vi) Late payment fees.

“(vii) Cash advance and convenience check fees.

“(viii) Balance transfer fees.

“(ix) Over-the-credit-limit fees.

“(x) Foreign currency conversion fees.

“(F) OTHER FEES AND CHARGES.—Data on any other fees and charges that the Board determines to be appropriate to meet the purposes of this section.

“(3) ANNUAL REPORT TO CONGRESS REQUIRED.—

“(A) PREPARATION.—The Board shall prepare a report of the results of each survey conducted pursuant to paragraph (1) and (2).

“(B) CONTENTS OF THE REPORT.—In addition to the data required to be collected pursuant to paragraphs (1) and (2), each report prepared pursuant to subparagraph (A) shall include a description of any discernible trend, in the Nation as a whole, in each of the 50 States, and in each metropolitan statistical area (as defined by the Director of the Office of Management and Budget), in the cost and availability of the retail banking services, including those described in paragraphs (1) and (2) (including related fees and minimum balances), that delineates differences between institutions on the basis of the type of institution, the size of the institution and any engagement of the institution in multistate activity.

“(C) SUBMISSION TO CONGRESS.—The Board shall submit an annual report to the Congress under this paragraph not later than June 1, 2002, and not later than June 1 of each subsequent year.

“(4) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this subsection, the terms ‘insured depository institution’ and ‘insured credit union’ mean any depository institution (as defined in subsection (b)(1)(A)) the deposits or shares in which are insured under the Federal Deposit Insurance Act or the Federal Credit Union Act.”.

(d) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Section 19 of the Federal Reserve Act (12 U.S.C. 461) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)(4) (12 U.S.C. 461(b)(4)), by striking subparagraph (C) and redesignating subparagraphs (D) and (E) as subparagraphs (C) and (D), respectively; and

(2) in subsection (c)(1)(A) (12 U.S.C. 461(c)(1)(A)), by striking “subsection (b)(4)(C)” and inserting “subsection (b)”.

SEC. 5. INCREASED FEDERAL RESERVE BOARD FLEXIBILITY IN SETTING RESERVE REQUIREMENTS.

Section 19(b)(2)(A) of the Federal Reserve Act (12 U.S.C. 461(b)(2)(A)) is amended—

(1) in clause (i), by striking “the ratio of 3 per centum” and inserting “a ratio not greater than 3 percent (and which may be zero)”;

(2) in clause (ii), by striking “and not less than 8 per centum,” and inserting “(and which may be zero)”.

SEC. 6. TRANSFER OF FEDERAL RESERVE SURPLUSES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 7(b) of the Federal Reserve Act (12 U.S.C. 289(b)) is amended

by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(4) ADDITIONAL TRANSFERS TO COVER INTEREST PAYMENTS FOR FISCAL YEARS 2002 THROUGH 2006.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—In addition to the amounts required to be transferred from the surplus funds of the Federal reserve banks pursuant to subsection (a)(3), the Federal reserve banks shall transfer from such surplus funds to the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System for transfer to the Secretary of the Treasury for deposit in the general fund of the Treasury, such sums as are necessary to equal the net cost of section 19(b)(12), as estimated by the Office of Management and Budget, in each of the fiscal years 2002 through 2006.

“(B) ALLOCATION BY FEDERAL RESERVE BOARD.—Of the total amount required to be paid by the Federal reserve banks under subparagraph (A) for fiscal years 2002 through 2006, the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System shall determine the amount each such bank shall pay in such fiscal year.

“(C) REPLENISHMENT OF SURPLUS FUND PROHIBITED.—During fiscal years 2002 through 2006, no Federal reserve bank may replenish such bank’s surplus fund by the amount of any transfer by such bank under subparagraph (A).”.

(b) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 7(a) of the Federal Reserve Act (12 U.S.C. 289(a)) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(3) PAYMENT TO TREASURY.—During fiscal years 2002 through 2006, any amount in the surplus fund of any Federal reserve bank in excess of the amount equal to 3 percent of the paid-in capital and surplus of the member banks of such bank shall be transferred to the Secretary of the Treasury for deposit in the general fund of the Treasury.”.

SEC. 7. RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.

No provision of this Act, or any amendment made by this Act, shall be construed as creating any presumption or implication that, in the case of an escrow account maintained at a depository institution in connection with a real estate transaction—

(1) the absorption, by the depository institution, of expenses incidental to providing a normal banking function with respect to such escrow account;

(2) the forbearance, by the depository institution, from charging a fee for providing any such banking function; and

(3) any benefit which may accrue to the holder or the beneficiary of such escrow account as a result of an action of the depository institution described in paragraph (1) or (2),

may be treated as the payment or receipt of interest for purposes of any provision of Public Law 93–100, the Federal Reserve Act, the Home Owners’ Loan Act, or the Federal Deposit Insurance Act relating to the payment of interest on accounts or deposits at depository institutions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. OXLEY) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. LAFALCE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. OXLEY).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. OXLEY. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on H.R. 974, the bill now under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. OXLEY. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes, and I rise today in support of H.R. 974, the Small Business Interest Checking Act. H.R. 974 lifts the ban on the payment of interest on checking accounts, increases the number of transfers which may be made from business accounts to depository institutions, authorizes the Federal Reserve to pay interest on sterile reserves, and gives the Fed flexibility in setting reserve limits.

The changes in current law made by H.R. 974 are long overdue and represent our continued efforts to update outdated laws that ultimately limit the choices of small businesses and consumers.

The legislation provides that after 2 years banks will be able to offer interest-bearing checking accounts to all customers. Because of a quirk in current law, America’s small businesses are the only entities that currently have little choice but to allow their money to sit idly in banks. This legislation will allow those small businesses to put their money to work.

The bill will also allow banks to earn interest on the money they are required by law to hold with the Federal Reserve. Like small businesses, America’s banks currently must hold money in accounts which give them no return. This has created an incentive for banks to put their money elsewhere, which in turn can damage the Federal Reserve’s ability to conduct monetary policy. The Federal Reserve supports us in this long-overdue change.

The bill will also give the Federal Reserve flexibility in setting reserve requirements, so that the market can respond to changing economic conditions.

The amendment will allow certain depository institutions to offer NOW accounts to all of their customers and clarify that certain transactions in connection with real estate escrow accounts are not to be treated as “interest” for any purpose under the legislation that we are considering.

The only difference between H.R. 974 that we consider today and the reported bill is an amendment requested by the Fed that describes the types of depository institutions which will be able to offer business NOW accounts.

Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. KELLY) and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY) for their leadership that they have shown on this issue. I also thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. LAFALCE), the ranking member, for his cooperation in moving this important bill.

Madam Speaker, the legislation we consider today advances the work begun by Congress with the passage of the Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act to make America’s financial services industry more efficient, and to provide consumers with more options.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support passage of H.R. 974.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LAFALCE. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. LAFALCE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LAFALCE. Madam Speaker, I agree with the overall thrust of H.R. 974, the Small Business Interest Checking Act, which permits banks and thrifts to offer interest-bearing business checking accounts; and I, therefore, support its adoption.

The repeal of the ban on interest-bearing business checking accounts represents another important step in the modernization of our financial services industry. The ban was adopted in the Great Depression out of fear that banks seeking business accounts would bid against each other with higher interest rates and thus contribute to bank insolvencies. The Federal banking agencies have all concluded, however, that the ban no longer serves any useful public purpose; that it is outdated in the modern financial services environment, and I concur.

Madam Speaker, this legislation promotes healthy competition within the financial services community for commercial checking accounts, which can only benefit the business community, and most especially the small business community, with more efficient, cost-effective financial services.

□ 1615

The current law and market conditions prevent many small businesses from obtaining easy access to interest-bearing checking accounts. For this reason, it is important that repeal of the ban be accomplished with a minimum of delay. The 2-year phase-in provided for in the bill, with 24 sweeps per month for money market demand accounts in the meantime, represents a fair compromise of the competing interests, although I personally would have preferred a shorter phase-in period.

However, I do have some reservations about the policy priorities represented by other provisions in the bill, provisions permitting the Federal Reserve Banks to pay interest on reserves. It is estimated that the sterile reserve provision will use \$1.1 billion of the projected surplus over the next 10 years. I am conscious of the view of many in the banking industry that the combination of required reserves and the inability to receive interest on those reserves is a burden on the industry.

I understand that. However, I believe that there are other priorities that should take precedence over interest on sterile reserves, priorities that provide funding for homes for the homeless, adequate funding for food for our hungry, adequate funding for medicine and health care for our sick. These and other governmental corporal works

should be given far greater precedence and priority by this body on this floor of the House.

Nevertheless, I support the bill, not only because it provides access to financial services for small businesses but also because it will improve Congress' ability to monitor the problem posed by ever-increasing bank fees. This was a very important amendment that we offered to the bill during markup which requires an annual assessment of the fees charged to retail bank customers. With fees representing an ever-growing share of bank earnings, an annual survey of retail bank fees becomes much more important than ever.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that H.R. 974 accomplishes two sound policy objectives. It provides small business access to interest-bearing checking accounts and it provides a much needed survey of retail banking fees. For those particular reasons, I support its adoption by the House.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. OXLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BACHUS), the chairman of the Subcommittee on Financial Institutions and Consumer Credit.

Mr. BACHUS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support for this legislation. I want to commend the chairman of the Committee on Financial Services for bringing this common sense measure to the floor today, for doing it promptly.

What does this legislation mean? What will it do? I have a letter here from the National Association of Federal Credit Unions which says that it will mean two things. It will mean that their customers, small businesses and their members of the credit unions will receive interest on their accounts, and it also means that their loan rates will be lower.

So I think anything we can do to lower the cost of loans for consumers is good. I think anything we can do to allow small businesses, whether they bank at a bank or a thrift or they are members of a credit union to be able to draw interest on those. It really is legislation that is going to benefit small businesses, whether they are the small banks, the thrifts or the credit unions or the small businesses that put deposits in those institutions. Large corporations already get implicit interest because large financial institutions have complex programs such as sweeps which allow the payment of something very akin to interest. But it is the small businesses today that have been denied the right to draw interest. That is why the NFIB and the Chamber of Commerce totally supports this legislation and has endorsed it.

It will also allow small banks, thrifts and credit unions in our hometowns to compete against large international financial conglomerates and large financial banks because it will make them more competitive and will allow them to keep more of their deposits. That is why the associations representing our

small banks and our thrifts have endorsed this legislation.

Finally, I want to praise the gentleman from Pennsylvania and the gentlewoman from New York who authored this legislation. We will hear from the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. KELLY) in a minute. I also want to praise a freshman member, the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania (Ms. HART), for her active work on this bill.

Finally, I would like to address what the gentleman from New York said about paying interest on regulation D reserves at the Federal Reserve. The Federal Reserve and the Treasury both came before us; and the Federal Reserve said if we are to maintain a solid monetary policy, a sound dollar, we need this legislation. That is reason enough to pass this.

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD the following letter from the National Association of Federal Credit Unions that I referred to in my remarks:

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF
FEDERAL CREDIT UNIONS,
Washington, DC, April 2, 2001.

Hon. SPENCER BACHUS,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Financial Institutions & Consumer Credit, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN BACHUS: I am writing on behalf of the National Association of Federal Credit Unions (NAFCU), the only national trade association that exclusively represents the interests of our nation's federal credit unions, to express our support for H.R. 974 as approved by the Financial Services Committee. NAFCU supports this effort to allow payment of interest on Regulation D reserve requirements of depository institutions, to increase the number of allowed transfers of non-interest-bearing accounts into those paying interest, and to include credit unions in a regular bank fee study by the Federal Reserve. NAFCU thanks you for your leadership on this issue and urges passage of H.R. 974.

Regulation D imposes costly burdens on regulated financial institutions such as federal credit unions. As member-owned co-operatives, credit unions have no choice but to pass the opportunity cost resulting from the posting of sterile reserves along to their members either in the form of lower dividend rates on savings, higher rates on loans, or some combination of the two. Under Regulation D Federal credit unions are required to structure accounts to meet regulatory definitions, limit transactions to required types and numbers, and must forego interest on sterile reserves. The cost of Regulation D contributes to the continuing exodus of savings from regulated financial institutions to the stock market, mutual funds, and other products of largely unregulated financial service providers.

The current Regulation D reserve ratios are 3% for transaction balances between \$0 and \$42.8 million with an exemption for balances below \$5.5 million. For institutions with reservable balances in excess of \$42.8 million, the reserve requirement is \$1,329,000 plus 10% of the deposits above \$42.8 million. Based on NAFCU year-end 2000 data and utilizing the current Regulation D tranches and ratios, 866 federally-chartered credit unions are currently required to post \$1,276,386,000 in required reserves. If legislation were enacted into law today and the Federal Reserve were to pay interest at the current Federal Funds rate of 5.5%, then these credit unions and

their member owners would collectively receive \$70,201,230 in interest.

As of December 2000, 121 credit unions had \$12.95 billion in reservable balances in excess of \$42.8 million and required reserves of \$938.7 million. Another 745 credit unions, with \$11.12 billion in reservable balances, had to hold \$337.6 million in required reserves.

With its non-payment of interest on sterile reserves, Regulation D gives an unfair advantage to non-regulated financial institutions that offer checking accounts but do not have to maintain sterile reserves with the Fed.

Furthermore, NAFCU supports the language sought by Representative John LaFalce (D-NY) and included by the Financial Services Committee to make permanent the bank fee study by the Federal Reserve Board and to include credit union fees as part of that study.

NAFCU appreciates your leadership on this issue and thanks you for pursuing this legislation. We urge the House to pass this important legislation. If I or my staff may be of assistance to you or if you have any questions or desire further information please do not hesitate to contact me or NAFCU's Director of Legislative and Political Affairs, Charlie Frohman, at (703) 522-4770.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM J. DONOVAN,
Senior Vice President/General Counsel.

Mr. OXLEY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. KELLY), the chairwoman of the Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations.

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Ohio for both yielding me the time and for his considerable efforts to move this legislation forward. I also want to thank my fellow New Yorker, ranking member, the gentleman from New York (Mr. LaFALCE), for his work on this issue and for allowing us to bring this legislation to the floor under suspension today.

My legislation today can be passed in such a way in which everyone wins. This has been an issue which has been pending before the Congress for the past 6 years. Last year, our committee passed everything before us now by a voice vote; and the full House also passed these provisions by a voice vote. It is my hope we can do that again today.

The Small Business Interest Checking Act contains four initiatives. First, to repeal the prohibition on allowing banks to pay interest on business checking accounts after a transition period. This prohibition has been in place since the 1930s.

While I believe it should be repealed, I believe a proper transition period is critical. The 2-year transition contained in this bill is not adequate in my estimation. However, I believe it is time that this legislation does move forward.

Second, this legislation allows banks to increase money market deposits and savings accounts sweeps from the current 6 to 24 times a month. This gives banks an increase in their sweep activities, enabling them to sweep every night, increasing the interest which businesses can make on their accounts.

Third, the bill gives the Federal Reserve the authority to pay interest on reserves banks keep in the Federal Reserve system. This is good economically since it will bring stability to the Federal funds rate which is subject to volatility when the reserves become too low. It is also good public policy since these reserves have functioned as an implicit tax on our banks and would partially offset the costs of a repeal of the prohibition on business checking.

Fourth and finally, my bill gives the Federal Reserve the additional flexibility to lower the reserve requirements. This will give the Federal Reserve greater control at maintaining reserves at a specific and consistent level.

My goal in this legislation is to best help our main street banks which are so essential to our small communities. Without their support, our communities would struggle where they are now thriving and stall where they now move. Quite simply, this legislation is about creating new and broader market options. We allow banks to pay interest on business checking accounts. We allow banks to increase sweep activities. And we allow the Fed to pay interest on the reserves all banks are required to keep with them. We also allow the Fed to lower reserve requirements. We do not require or mandate anything. This way we can allow the market to create change, not the government.

Mr. Speaker, I have much, much more to say on this legislation but in the interest of time, I will place the rest of my comments in the RECORD. I again thank the gentleman from Ohio for his strong leadership on this issue and for the swift consideration of this legislation. I ask my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to join me in strong support for this common sense bipartisan legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. OXLEY] for both yielding me the time and for his considerable efforts to move this legislation forward. I also want to thank my fellow New Yorker, Ranking Member LaFALCE, for his work on this issue and for allowing us to bring this legislation to the floor under suspension today. In addition, I want to thank the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BACHUS] for his work as well as the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. TOOMEY] for the very significant contribution he made to this legislation with his bill, H.R. 1009, which was merged into my bill during committee consideration.

My legislation today can be passed in such a way in which everyone wins. This has been an issue which has been pending before Congress for the past six years. Last year our committee passed everything now before us by voice vote and the full House also passed these provisions by a voice vote.

Provisions of this legislation enjoy strong support from a diverse group of associations. The list of these groups includes the American Bankers Association, America's Community Bankers, The National Federation of Small Businesses, The Financial Services Roundtable, The National Association of Federal Credit Unions, The National Chamber of Com-

merce, The Credit Union National Association, and The National Farm Bureau.

Mr. Speaker, one issue which has held this legislation up in past years has been the issue of the transition period from the bill's enactment to when banks are allowed to pay interest on business checking accounts. Currently, the bill contains a two year transition period. This is a shorter transition period than was contained in Congresswomen ROUKEMA's bill, H.R. 1585, the Depository Institutions Regulatory Streamlining Act, in the 105th which passed the House on October 8, 1998 by voice vote. How many years was the delay in H.R. 1585? Six years. Again last year the House passed Congressman Metcalf's bill, H.R. 4067, which again contained this issue, but this time contained a three year transition period. I supported that deal last year and continue to support a three or four year transition period. This transition period are not arbitrary and have been contained in laws that have made changes to interest payments in the past. When Congress enacted legislation to gradually remove interest rate controls on consumer checking accounts in the 1980s (Reg Q), it did so with a six-year transition period.

We have listened to testimony before the Financial Services committee about why banks need this transition period to unravel the agreements they currently have with their business customers. Those groups advocating for shorter transition periods unfortunately seek to create instability in the banking sector. For some this is intentional. The Thrifts, until recently, were prohibited from business checking activities. They would like this authority in attempt to attract business clients from the banks. I don't blame them for this, but the small community banks with assets under \$2 billion will suffer under this scenario without a transition.

Those who argue that since there is no transition period in the bill for the Fed to pay interest on reserves ignore the innumerable differences between banks and the Fed and the very different reasons we are changing these laws. One has to do with effective monetary policy of the Fed and the other about the more efficient operation of our banks.

Let me also clear the air on another point. The Federal Reserve is opposed to a transition period of this length. They see this in a purely economic perspective. They believe that the disruptions this policy presents will work themselves out.

Well I stand in strong disagreement with the Fed's read of this issue. Banks have long established relationships with the business customers they serve. These banks, while being prohibited in paying interest on reserves provide other tangible benefits to their business customers, such as doing the payroll for the business.

These banks need time to properly prepare for this change we are proposing to the law. They need to be able to sit down with their commercial accounts when their loans turn over, which is every few years.

Some may speak about wasteful sweep activities. Sweeps may be more complicated but they do not hurt the small banks that way. The repeal of the prohibition will. Sweeps are temporarily invested outside of the bank typically in safe repurchase agreements involving T-bills. This imposes zero cost to the bank and the commercial accounts can earn interest. I also

refer to an article from the American Banker I inserted into the record during a hearing last May. It stated that the majority of small banks operate sweep accounts. The computer programs are becoming much simpler and less costly to handle these activities. Additionally, if banks can do this every day they are not limited to commercial customers that keep large balances in the accounts.

Some will say that this bill does not require the payment of interest on commercial accounts, it just allows it. That's true but the market place will require it in order to remain competitive.

Let me sum this up with one final observation. The banks that will be hardest hit with this new cost will be the smaller banks. This will make them more liable to takeovers and jeopardize the best friend of the small businesses—Small banks. We must do everything we can to preserve small banks. They need time to prepare, and should at least give them more time to do so.

Again, I want to thank the Gentleman from Ohio, [Mr. OXLEY] for his strong support and leadership on this issue. I also want to thank all of the others I have worked with on this issue that deserve some of the credit, this list includes former Congressman Jack Metcalf, for whom these issues were one of his highest priorities; Congressman JIM LEACH, whose leadership on these issues ensured a fair debate; Congresswoman MARGE ROUKEMA, whose attention to these issues has been both helpful and thoughtful; Congressman SPENCER BACHUS, whose insights and encouragement have helped drive this debate; Congressman PAT TOOMEY, who brought his first hand experience and considerable knowledge to this issue; Senator CHARLES SCHUMER, for his strong support for our priorities on this legislation in the Senate; I also need to thank the staff, especially Terry Haines, Bob Foster, Hugh Halpern, Gregg Zerzan, Jim Clinger, Garry Parker, Laurie Schaffer, and Alison Watson.

Without the assistance of these good folks we would not have been able to bring such a strong bill to the floor this year. We have before us the best opportunity to move this legislative package through the process. I hope we are able to take advantage of this opportunity. I stand ready to work with all interested parties to ensure that this legislation truly benefits all concerned.

Mr. OXLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY) who has been a leader and one of the original sponsors of this legislation.

(Mr. TOOMEY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TOOMEY. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Ohio for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge my colleagues to pass H.R. 974. This is a bill that contains a number of very good, sensible provisions. As we have heard, it will allow the Federal Reserve to pay interest on sterile reserves; and we have heard that it will give flexibility to the Federal Reserve in setting reserve requirements which in turn will help in maintaining our monetary policy.

This bill also includes language from H.R. 1009 which I introduced to allow

banks to pay interest on commercial checking accounts. Now, as we all know and we recall from last year, we passed sweeping modernization legislation, modernizing the legal framework within which the financial services industry is regulated. It was historic legislation. We repealed antiquated laws that dated back to the Depression. But we missed one, one that we missed was repeal of the prohibition on interest on corporate checking accounts. So today we are going to take that up, among other things.

Let me address that specifically as a part of the bill that I had focused mostly on. First of all, repealing the prohibition on interest on business checking is not really for big banks. Oh, it will apply to big banks but as a practical matter, big banks, large, sophisticated financial institutions have the means to circumvent this prohibition and they have done so for years, quite legally, quite appropriately. Through a very sophisticated series of transactions, they can offer implicit interest if not explicit interest.

This really is also not for large corporations. As the gentleman from Alabama mentioned earlier, large corporations have ways around this as well. They have sophisticated Treasury operations. They have the ability with extensive full-time staff to make sure they do not have idle cash sitting there not earning interest.

What this legislation is really for is small banks and small business. It is for small banks that do not have the means to develop ways to circumvent the prohibition. It will allow them simply to directly pay the interest that they want to pay so that they can compete with the larger institutions and can attract deposits.

And it is for small businesses, small businesses that do not have the resources to have a Treasury operation. They do not have the manpower to devote countless hours to making sure there are no idle reserves. What this bill is going to do is it is going to allow those small businesses which struggle so much to provide so many jobs and so much of the vigorous growth in our economy in recent years, it is going to allow them to be a little more competitive and give them a little bit more of a break by allowing them to earn interest on the deposits that they own.

It is quite appropriate also as the gentlewoman from New York pointed out that there is no mandate in this bill. This simply allows business and banking institutions to decide amongst themselves without the prohibition of government to decide how much if any interest will be paid on these accounts. But I am confident that market pressures being what they are will develop an habitual interest for these balances as ought to be the case.

It is long overdue. I think we are getting to the point where we are going to pass this legislation. I am hopeful that the other Chamber will do likewise. I

just want to thank the chairman, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. OXLEY). I would also like to thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KANJORSKI) and the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BACHUS) for their leadership in this effort as well as the ranking member, the gentleman from New York (Mr. LAFALCE). I urge my colleagues to pass this legislation.

Mr. OXLEY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New Jersey (Mrs. ROUKEMA), the chairwoman of the Subcommittee on Housing and Community Opportunity.

(Mrs. ROUKEMA asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. ROUKEMA. Mr. Speaker, I certainly want to express my strong support for this legislation and urge that it be passed. I want to particularly commend the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. KELLY) and certainly the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BACHUS), the chairman of the Subcommittee on Financial Institutions and Consumer Credit, for what they have outlined in their opening statements and associate myself with their remarks.

I do want to also make the observation that this was passed, at least in the House, in the 105th and the 106th Congress. I am hopeful that this time, the third time "will be the charm" and that we are going to get this passed. It makes absolute, complete sense. Although I was one that originally wanted the 3-year phase-in, I believe that this bill strikes the proper, good compromise, using the 2-year phase-in.

□ 1630

Of course, the NFIB and the U.S. Chamber, as has already been reported, strongly support the repeal; and we have a large segment of the banking industry and the thrift industries that are supportive. I guess I just have to say that this is long overdue. It is a compromise with the 2-year phase-in which will be included in this bill, and I trust that we will finally be successful this year. Again, long overdue and we must do our job here today.

The controversy in past Congresses and during consideration in the Financial Services Committee this year has been the appropriate time frame for repeal.

While I support a 3-year phase-in, I believe the bill before us today strikes a good compromise between the one year and three year alternatives. The one year transition period in the original bill is just too short. Removing the prohibition against the payment on commercial Demand Deposit Accounts raises a variety of difficult transition issues, especially for smaller financial institutions.

Banks currently assume a stable deposit base with stable costs when they enter commercial checking account relationships with small businesses. These contractual relations frequently include a number of other products—such as loans for periods ranging from 5–25 years—at a price and for a period of time that takes into account that the bank is not paying interest on the underlying business checking account.

The immediate implementation of paying interest on those accounts would disrupt the cost/profit assumption under which those loans were made and would require a renegotiation of the overall relationship. If banks are required to pay interest immediately, they would be required to adjust investment portfolios at a time of high market volatility.

Banks will be required to review all current customer contracts; determine steps necessary to honor existing commitments for both public and private sectors. Many contracts, particularly those with state, local and federal governments have time periods from 12–36 months and would require substantial adjustments.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation is long overdue and with the compromise of a two year phase in which is included in this bill, I trust that we can finally enact this legislation this year. I urge my colleagues support.

Mr. OXLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I would point out that this was a brilliant maneuver on the part of the committee. There were arguments whether it should be an extension of 3 years or 1 year, and after great deliberation and a lot of hard work we decided to compromise on 2 years.

They said it could not be done, but we were able to do that; and I want to thank everybody for their participation.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania (Ms. HART), a new member of our committee and a very valuable member.

Ms. HART. Mr. Speaker, I also rise in support of H.R. 974. I am a big fan of giving flexibility to people in their own businesses. Understanding that banks are heavily regulated and understanding also that there was a concern when this initial law was instituted back in the 1930s, that was a long time ago, Mr. Speaker, and it is no longer reasonable for us to be concerned that these banks will put themselves out of business by paying interest to their business customers.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation abolishes a ban that is long overdue, preventing banks from offering interest on their business checking accounts. I do not think it is time for us anymore to be worried that these banks would fail because they would pay interest to their business customers. In fact, as a result of Graham-Leach-Bliley, this is just the natural next step.

We tried to give the financial services industries more flexibility. We succeeded with Graham-Leach-Bliley, and I think this is simply the next step. I believe that the men and women who run our financial institutions certainly have the training and are much more competent than we are to make those business decisions for them.

This policy actually prevented a lot of those financial institutions, those small banks, from being competitive; and like many other districts across the country, my district is heavily populated with some very strong, very successful financial institutions, the Main

Street banks that keep a lot of people employed and that provide a very good resource for a lot of small businesspeople.

This will certainly allow them to provide even more of a resource for small businesspeople, those who are building up their businesses and want to support the other industries within their own hometown. Now, that hometown bank will be able to provide them with an additional incentive to invest with them.

Mr. Speaker, it promotes competition. It promotes consumer convenience. It will repeal, as I said, an outdated and I believe anticompetitive impediment to attracting these interest-bearing accounts to these smaller financial institutions, but also to give the larger financial institutions an opportunity to offer interest.

Mr. OXLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BEREUTER), the chairman of the Subcommittee on International Monetary Policy and Trade.

(Mr. BEREUTER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. OXLEY) for yielding me time to speak on this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I commend the gentleman and the ranking member, particularly the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. KELLY), for her effort; the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BACHUS.) This has been, as was mentioned, 3 years in the making.

Much has been said, and I would extend my remarks to cover some of the details that have been covered in part by others or perhaps wholly; but I want to say that the emphasis should be here on the positive effect that this will have on small businesses nationwide, not just banks but their small business customers. I think that is the most important thing for us to consider. Yes, it affects sterile reserves that the Fed holds, and it permits those sterile reserves to bring interest to the banks involved. I think that is only a matter of equity.

The most important part, I think, is the fact that the banking laws implemented during the Great Depression are changed. They have prohibited banks and thrifts from paying interest on business checking accounts. What I expect to happen now is that we are going to have a competition among financial institutions to take advantage of this opportunity to pay interest on these checking accounts.

This has, in effect, been done, as mentioned, by large banks in a different way. Small banks have not had the technical expertise or the capacity to offer this service by sweeps to small customers, small business customers. This will now be possible. It deserves our support. I urge my colleagues of the whole House to vote yes on this legislation.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 974, Small Business

Interest Checking Act. This bill is a step in the right direction because it aims at diminishing the comparative disadvantage that certainly exists for small banks and small businesses.

Banking laws implemented during the Great Depression currently prohibit banks and thrifts from paying interests on business checking accounts. Large banks often get around this restriction, however, by periodically transferring a company's checking account to an interest-bearing account—with the money transferred back after it has earned interest. But banks are only allowed to make such transfers six times per month, and small banks often cannot offer these "sweep" accounts because of legal constraints or because they lack the technical expertise to do so. Consequently, smaller banks and the small businesses that bank at those institutions are often left at a competitive disadvantage.

H.R. 974 allows banks and thrifts to pay interest on balances held in business checking accounts, and it permits the Federal Reserve to pay interest on the Fed-held "sterile" reserves of bank. At the moment, they obtain no interest. This bill is intended to eliminate the competitive disadvantage that currently exist for both small banks and small businesses concerning business-checking accounts. It is also aimed at encouraging banks to leave funds in those accounts for which they must post cash reserves with the Federal Reserve—which would boost reserves held by the Federal Reserve and thereby enhance its ability to conduct national monetary policy.

For example, the bill allows—but does not require—the Federal Reserve to pay interest on the cash reserves that banks are required to maintain at Federal Reserve banks. The rate of interest to be paid would be paid by the Federal Reserve, but could not exceed the general level of short-term interest rates.

Any mechanisms that may facilitate the growth of small businesses in the banking industry are very important. For this reason, I support this measure. Under the proposed legislation, small business may now obtain an interest on their banking accounts. We must do our best to assist our small businesses in eliminating barriers to economic growth.

Mr. LAFALCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. OXLEY. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHAYS). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. OXLEY) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 974, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The title of the bill was amended so as to read:

Amend the title so as to read "A bill to repeal the prohibition on the payment of interest on demand deposits, to increase the number of interaccount transfers which may be made from business accounts at depository institutions, to authorize the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System to pay interest on reserves, and for other purposes."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PRINTING OF REVISED AND UPDATED VERSION OF "WOMEN IN CONGRESS, 1917-1990"

Mr. NEY. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 66) authorizing the printing of a revised and updated version of the House document entitled "Women in Congress, 1917-1990".

The Clerk read as follows:

H. CON. RES. 66

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring),

SECTION 1. PRINTING OF REVISED VERSION OF "WOMEN IN CONGRESS, 1917-1990".

(a) IN GENERAL.—An updated version of House Document 101-238, entitled "Women in Congress, 1917-1990" (as revised by the Library of Congress), shall be printed as a House document by the Public Printer, with illustrations and suitable binding, under the direction of the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives.

(b) NUMBER OF COPIES.—In addition to the usual number, there shall be printed 30,700 copies of the document referred to in subsection (a), of which—

(1) 25,000 shall be for the use of the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives; and

(2) 5,700 shall be for the use of the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. NEY) and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. NEY).

Mr. NEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, before us today we have House Concurrent Resolution 66. It is my pleasure to be here today to speak on behalf of this bill authorizing the printing of this rich history of women in Congress. It is also timely, as we now have a record number of 74 women serving in both the House and the Senate in the 107th Congress. Sixty-one women, including two delegates, currently serve as Members of the House of Representatives, and 13 women serve as Members of the U.S. Senate.

The first woman elected to Congress was Jeanette Rankin, a Republican from Montana. It is not that I planned it that way, Mr. Speaker, but a Republican from Montana who served in the House. She was elected on November 9, 1916. Amazingly, this was almost 4 years before American women won the right to vote in 1920. Since that time, a total of 208 women have served in Congress with distinction.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to yield the balance of my time for purposes of control to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to join the chairman of the committee as an original cosponsor of House Concurrent Resolution 66, and I am proud to speak in favor of its passage. This resolution authorizes the printing of a document which chronicles the contributions of women serving in this great body. It provides interesting facts about their backgrounds and their careers, which have inspired many, including me, to run for Congress and serve the American people.

It talks about women, such as my predecessor, Ruth Bryan Owen. She was the first woman Member from Florida. I am proud to be the second woman Member from Florida. She served from 1929 to 1933; and she was, as this book points out, the daughter of the peerless leader, three-time Presidential nominee William Jennings Bryan.

We have had women such as Corrine Clairborne Lindy Boggs, for which the Ladies' Reading Room is named, from the district of Louisiana, elected in March 1973, and honored this body with her presence for many years.

When she was first elected to fill the seat of her late husband, she was thoroughly familiar with the world of Capitol Hill and Louisiana issues because she had worked side by side with her husband, a 14-term representative and a majority leader.

Lindy Boggs used this experience to serve the people of Louisiana, and we are proud that the Ladies' Reading Room is under her name and that the administrator of that room, Susan Dean, very proudly is part of that women's history in Congress.

There have also been trail blazers, Mr. Speaker, such as Edith Rogers. She was a representative from Massachusetts who served on the Committee of Veterans' Affairs in the 80th and 83rd Congress. She served with the American Red Cross in the care of disabled World War I veterans and served as the personal representative of President Harding and President Coolidge before disabled veterans; and interestingly, she checked herself into a Boston hospital under an assumed name to avoid the publicity of bad health, and she died while serving in this Chamber. She was actually reelected during that time on September 10, 1960.

She remains to this day the longest serving woman Member in Congress, 17 terms after replacing her husband.

Then there is the story that the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. NEY) talked about of Jeanette Rankin, Republican of Montana, the first woman Member of the House, who voted against U.S. involvement in World War I, was defeated after that vote, and then she came back, voted against U.S. involvement in World War II and was defeated again.

Now, there is a very interesting history of women in Congress, Mr. Speaker, and without us having the authority to reprint "The Women in Congress, 1917-1990," we will be missing a piece of our Nation's history.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to support this concurrent resolution introduced during Women's History Month by my distinguished friend, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR). The gentlewoman has consistently led this House on issues related to women. I want to thank her for introducing this resolution, highlighting the need to revise and reprint this important volume to which the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) has already referred.

I also want to thank the chairman for his strong support and for bringing the measure to the floor so quickly. Since the publication of "Women in Congress," the number of women who have served has risen by more than 61 percent, from 129 in 1990 to 208 today. That is a remarkable rise in just 11 years.

It demonstrates, Mr. Speaker, the profound contribution that American women are now able to make to the public life of our great country, and indeed that they have made throughout the history of this Nation. We must remember that it was not always so.

There is an extraordinary woman whose name is Margaret Brent. Margaret Brent was one of the first women lawyers in the colony, one of the first women landholders. She comes from Maryland, St. Mary's County, and she was the adviser to our governor back in the 17th century.

She was made a member of the Governor's Council; added to the legislature, but they would not give her a vote. They would not give her a vote, of course, because she was a woman. She is not in this book; but if she lived today, she clearly would be.

We must remember that for too long we discriminated against women in this Nation. It is almost hard to believe that it was not until the third decade of the last century that women were given the vote in America by constitutional amendment.

Although the 107th Congress includes a record 74 women, Mr. Speaker, there were no women, not one, in the 1st Congress or the 14th or the 24th, or the 44th, or even the 64th Congress, 128 years into the history of the Congress of the United States.

Not until, Mr. Speaker, the 65th Congress, that met in 1917, during the 129th year, did a woman, Jeanette Rankin of Montana, take the oath of office as a Representative. It was not until 1922, during the 67th Congress, that a woman, Rebecca Felton of Georgia, took the oath as a Senator.

Of the more than 11,600 individuals who have served in the two Houses since 1789, fewer than 2 percent have been women.

Ironically, when Representative Rankin first took her seat in this House, women had not yet secured the right to vote nationwide.

□ 1645

This most cherished right of citizenship was not guaranteed for all American women until the ratification of the 19th Amendment in 1920. How stark a fact, Mr. Speaker, that is. We quote, and I do as well, Jefferson's historic observation that all men are created equal and endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights. What a lesson it is for us that even in stirring rhetoric, our vision can be limited. Even at a time when we think we are reaching out to all, our rhetoric may exclude many. It is a lesson for us, because clearly Thomas Jefferson was one of the great democrats with a small "D" in the history of the world. But even Jefferson was blind to the discrimination that existed, not only against women, but against African Americans, most of whom when he intoned those words were still perceived as chattels, not human beings. How sad, but how instructive, that is.

Mr. Speaker, during the first 128 years under our present Constitution, no woman's voice could be heard in debate here. The experiences, perspectives, hopes and dreams of America's women were not voiced in this body by a woman. However, hopefully, and I believe they were expressed by men, but imperfectly so, because it is very difficult for us to walk in one another's shoes if we have a gender difference or a color difference, or even a religious or national difference. It is impossible to know how the absence of women may have affected the deliberations of the first 64 Congresses of the United States. Common sense, however, suggests the effect was not beneficial.

Fortunately, today, women not only can, but do, contribute in a direct, vital and historic way to the deliberations of this Congress and other policymaking bodies throughout the Federal, State and local governments. This is as it should be and as it should have been from the beginning.

As we move forward, Mr. Speaker, more women will have the opportunity to serve in Congress and other public offices throughout the land, strengthening and enriching our democracy. This, too, is as it should be. If I know anything about women in Congress, it is that there are not enough.

Mr. Speaker, a new edition of "Women in Congress" will gather in one updated volume useful, historical information for teachers, students and others, chronicling the careers of the 208 women who have served in either House to date. I am proud to support this resolution which is cosponsored by all of the women of this House. As we enter the 21st Century, we must continue to mark the progress and substantial contribution that women are making in this, the most democratic legislative body on Earth, but, I might observe, not the body that has the highest percentage of women. I am confident the new volume will quickly become, like the previous edition, a tremendous historical resource, inspiring

young women across America to seek careers in public service that may one day bring them all, or many of them, to this hallowed hall.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the Members of the House to support this concurrent resolution unanimously.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, we have another speaker before I close, so I reserve the balance of my time because she has not arrived yet.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR). I use "gentleman" and "gentlewoman" as a term of endearment that we use to speak of one another, but no one ought to misread that phrase. She is strong, she is courageous, she is tough, she is focused, and she is effective. She has added to this institution, as so many of the women in this book have. Mr. Speaker, she is the dean, the senior, not the oldest, he stresses, but the dean of the Democratic women in the House of Representatives.

(Ms. KAPTUR asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend from Maryland for those overly generous introductory remarks. I will read them in my lower moments.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of Concurrent Resolution 66 and offer my deep appreciation to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), who is the ranking member of the subcommittee that is moving this legislation to the floor. I thank him for his consistent and strong and forceful support of women's issues here in this Congress, including the publication of the History of Women's Service to our Nation at the Federal level.

I would also like to thank the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. NEY). Ohio is the first State in the Union through Oberlin College to admit women to higher education. We thank both of these really wonderful men for allowing us—the women of America—to walk alongside them as we move onward in this 21st century. If other matters in this institution flowed through such capable hands as the gentleman's from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) and the gentleman's from Ohio (Mr. NEY), I think we could move other bills through this Congress in a more expeditious fashion. The entire Nation would be more properly served.

Mr. Speaker, let me point out that 11 years ago when the 101st Congress marked the bicentenary of this institution, the volume that the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) referenced, *Women in Congress, 1917 to 1990*, was published. The second most senior Congresswoman in the House then, Congresswoman Lindy Boggs of Louisiana, who later was appointed as the first woman Ambassador to the Vatican, took responsibility for the printing of that document.

Since that time, another 79 women have served. Thus a new edition of *Women of Congress* will gather in one updated volume information for teachers, students and future Members of this body, information about the 208 women out of the nearly 12,000 Americans that have served in this institution to date, throughout all of America's history, including the 61 who now serve here in the House.

Mr. Speaker, I see that the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD) and the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) and the gentlewoman from Maryland (Mrs. MORELLA) are here with us this afternoon. They really are a part of a very new, but growing and important part of American history.

We currently have 74 women serving in both the House and the Senate. Mr. Speaker, this would actually be a reprint of that original version, and the resolution for this was entered this past March during Women's History Month.

Let me say it is a particular privilege to remind our colleagues that this resolution is cosponsored by every single woman serving in the House, as well as every other single Member of the House Committee on Administration. I deeply thank every one of them, especially the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), who has been a force inside this institution for equal voices for women, and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. NEY) for allowing us to participate in this introduction and passage today.

During the first 128 years of America's history, no woman served in either House of this Congress for nearly a century and a quarter. Finally, in the early years of this past century, the 20th century, after decades of struggle for women's political and social equality, we began to see some fruit be born. In 1917, Jeanette Rankin of Montana became the first woman to serve in this House of Representatives, and then 5 years later, Rebecca Felton of Georgia became the first woman Senator. So, for our entire history, the written word and the spoken word of women in political environments is still very fresh and very new.

Since Representatives Rankin and Felton broke the congressional gender barrier, dozens of women have followed in their footsteps. We wait for the day when it will be thousands.

Mr. Speaker, as we enter the 21st century, the time has come to update and reprint "Women in Congress." With it America marks the progress and substantial contribution that women are making in this most democratic legislative body on Earth.

I am confident that a revised volume will quickly become, like the previous edition, a tremendous historical resource and serve to inspire readers across America to seek careers in public service. I hope my colleagues in the House support this resolution. It is important especially that we do this and thus introduced this resolution during Women's History Month in March; and thus the concurrent

resolution that I have introduced would provide for the reprinting of that revised edition of the House document.

Mr. Speaker, I would ask my colleagues to support this resolution to reprint and update the edition of *Women in Congress, 1917 to 1990*, to make it current for this new 21st century, when all opportunities are available to young women and men across our country, and, indeed, America is an ideal for so much of the world to follow.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to thank the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) for her remarks. She does credit to this Congress, credit to Ohio, credit to her district, and certainly credit to her gender. It is a privilege to be her colleague in the Congress of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD), cochair of the Congressional Caucus for Women's Issues, who herself does an extraordinary job.

Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD. Mr. Speaker, I, too, would like to lend my support and thanks to the chairman and the ranking member, those two men who have seen the need and who have been very sensitive to the women of this House and past women by bringing this H. Con. Res. 66 to the House today.

I rise, Mr. Speaker, to support this resolution concerning the revision of the document, *Women in Congress, 1917 to 1990*. This book chronicles the biographies of the 129 women who served in the House and Senate during that period, but since that printing, another 79 women have served in Congress. The contributions of these women need to be recorded for present-day significance and posterity.

The outstanding women who served and are serving in the House and Senate come from different walks of life. They are lawyers, teachers, social workers, mothers, doctors, veterans, child care providers, grandmothers, all serving in various roles and serving in this House. Their stories need to be told.

We will begin with Jeanette Rankin, the first woman to be elected to the U.S. House of Representatives in March of 1917, 3 years before the ratification of the 19th amendment, which gave women the right to vote. Another pioneer was Edith Nourse Rogers, who served in Congress from 1925 to 1960 for a total of 35 years until her death. Shirley Chisholm broke the color barrier in 1969 when she became the first African American woman elected to the House, and Carol Moseley-Braun was the first African American woman in the Senate. These women and all women serve in Congress as role models for current and future generations of girls and women.

We want and need women to pursue public service in all segments of government, especially in the House and

Senate. We are 61 strong in the House and 13 in the Senate, which makes up 74, and we want to see those numbers grow. As the cochair of the Congressional Caucus on Women's Issues, we are certainly the voice of American women, monitoring legislation that addresses their health, education, children, child care and family needs.

□ 1700

Women have come to appreciate the advocacy of our work. While we have achieved many victories since 1917, Mr. Speaker, we still have a long way to go, especially in the area of pay equity and health research and delivery.

Today being Pay Equity Day, Congress has not been able to successfully pass legislation to make sure that women receive equal pay for comparable work. So our job is not over. We will not rest until our daughters and granddaughters obtain the right to be paid equally for comparable work.

Mr. Speaker, we thank all of the outstanding men who have brought this to the floor today.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I am very proud to yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Maryland (Mrs. MORELLA).

(Mrs. MORELLA asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. MORELLA. It is a pleasure for me to appear, Mr. Speaker, to express my support for this concurrent resolution.

I want to thank my colleague, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR), for bringing the issue to the floor. I want to thank our ranking member, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), who is handling the bill, and certainly the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) for handling the bill on the majority side.

One hundred years ago, the 101st Congress printed "*Women in Congress, 1917-1990*," a collection of photographs and biographies of the 129 women who had served in the House and Senate.

Since 1989, 79 women have been elected to Congress. Printing a new edition of "*Women in Congress*" makes sense. It would update this historical information for teachers, students, and others about the 208 women who have served to date, including the 61 now in the House and 13 in the Senate.

Mention has been made by my colleague about the first woman who was elected to Congress, who, incidentally, was a Republican, Jeannette Rankin from the State of Montana, who was elected before women had the right to vote. They could vote in her State, but they could not vote nationally until 1920. Incidentally, she voted against two world wars, so she was an historic figure.

There was Edith Nourse Rogers, who holds the record for length of service by a woman in Congress, 35 years in the House.

But Mr. Speaker, we need to also do some correcting in the new edition. For

instance, my colleague, the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN), was actually elected in 1989, and she is the first Hispanic woman elected to the U.S. House of Representatives.

Equally necessary as recognizing trailblazers is recognizing the women who, in 2001, fill only 13 percent of the elected Federal positions. So even though we think that we have added a lot of women, we still only have 13 percent of elected Federal positions.

I really believe that despite this disparity in representation, these women in Congress also serve as role models. I think it is very important that they have that opportunity to demonstrate to other young women that they, too, can serve their country in public service. By updating the "*Women in Congress*" publication and sharing our stories with schools, libraries, and constituents, we help to open doors for those who will follow and lead.

I urge my colleagues to support this House concurrent resolution. Again, I thank the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) for introducing it.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

As has been pointed out time and time again in our conversations, in 1989, the first time that this book was authorized to be printed as a House document, there were only 31 women serving in the Congress; 29 in the House, two in the Senate. Since that time, the number of women serving in each body has steadily increased, although not fast enough.

As the gentlewoman from Maryland (Mrs. MORELLA) pointed out, 70 women have served in Congress throughout just the last 10 years, the last time that this book was published.

But numbers alone do not adequately tell the story. That is why the printing of this book and this history is so important. It memorializes in detail and with illustrations the invaluable contributions women have made for many years as Members of Congress. Each in different and invaluable ways has made and continues to make a tremendous contribution to our country, and particularly to the constituents whom we serve.

There is no question that each has made an everlasting difference to Congress as an institution, and to the many issues which they have advocated, and indeed, have arisen before this body and our Nation.

I want to thank in particular the sponsors of the bill, including the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR), and additionally I would like to thank all of the cosponsors, including the members of the Committee on the House Administration, both on the majority, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. NEY), and the minority, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), and their staffs, who have worked so hard to bring this bill to the floor today.

Although I love and respect the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR), I

would like to point out that the dean of the women in Congress is in fact the gentlewoman from New Jersey (Mrs. ROUKEMA), a Republican.

I hope that soon one of our newest members of the United States Congress is the one sitting right behind me, Patricia Lehtinen, my daughter, who I hope will serve in my district, and I hope that my constituents bring me back many years to come.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, it looks to me like the young Ms. Lehtinen is probably 10, 11, 12 years old?

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOYER. I yield to the gentlewoman from Florida.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I would tell the gentleman from Maryland, she is 13.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I apologize. I am a long way away.

That means that apparently our distinguished acting chair intends to serve at least another 12 years.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. If the gentleman will continue to yield, Mr. Speaker, perhaps we could add a little amendment to the United States Constitution and make that change. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentlewoman.

Mr. Speaker, last week we passed a resolution which would update the book which includes African Americans; or actually, 2 weeks ago. This week we will appropriately recognize the women who have served.

As the father of three daughters, all adults, and a grandfather of two young women as well as two young men, those who have said that the women who serve are role models I think are absolutely correct, not only for young women who may want to go into public service, but for young women who aspire to reach the heights that their talents will allow them to. It is important that we nurture in these extraordinary American women the ability to succeed; the ability to make a very significant contribution; the ability to be equal, as Jefferson surely would have said today.

So I am pleased to rise in support of this resolution. It is appropriate, it is timely, and it is important for all Americans.

Mr. ROGERS of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to support legislation that would abolish a Depression-era ban that prevents banks from offering interest on business checking accounts. Small businesses are hit particularly hard by the current prohibition, because they are typical unable to help larger depositors circumvent the prohibition. While larger businesses have the financial resources to use sweep arrangements, these products are not offered to small businesses because they cannot make the minimum investment necessary to participate in "sweeps."

As part of a small, family-owned home building business in Michigan, I know firsthand

how slim the margins of operating a small business can be. This is why the Small Business Interest Checking Act is so important to our hometown retailers and businesses because it would give these smaller operations the opportunity to finally earn a much-needed market rate of return on their deposits. And any businessman or woman in the country will tell you what a difference an extra percentage or two can make to their bottom line.

As approved by the Committee on Financial Services, the Small Business Interest Checking Act contains language completely repealing the prohibition two years after enactment. The phase-in is included to assist institutions that currently offer sweep account arrangements, which are often based on multi-year contractual agreements. While I am personally of the preference that small business would benefit the most from legislation providing banks the voluntary option to pay interest on business checking accounts without a delay, I strongly support H.R. 974 and encourage my House colleagues do the same.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 974 and I would like to take just a moment to address a provision affecting the twenty-two industrial banks in my State of California.

Chairman OXLEY was good enough to include in the Committee reported version of H.R. 974 a provision I requested offering a measure of equity and fairness to these twenty-two industrial banks as we implement a national policy permitting interest on business checking accounts. I want to thank him and his staff for their assistance in this matter.

This provision, in Section 3 of H.R. 974, has now been amended to reflect comments offered by the Federal Reserve. The provision amends the Federal Deposit Insurance Act by adding a new paragraph (3) to Section 2 of that Act (PL-93-100).

H.R. 974 would therefore permit a California industrial bank to offer to any account holder, including a business entity, interest bearing negotiable orders of withdrawal—commonly called NOW accounts—so long as applicable California law continues to prohibit industrial banks from offering demand deposit accounts—which it does, and so long as the California industrial bank is not an affiliate of any company or companies whose aggregate assets are more than ten percent of the total assets of that particular industrial bank.

As a practical matter, I believe this provision would enable all of California's twenty-two industrial banks to offer NOW accounts to business entities, if they so choose.

California industrial bank law has been—and remains in its most recent reform—explicit in its prohibition against industrial banks accepting demand deposit (checking) accounts. Also, for the most part, California's industrial banks are small depository institutions and few have operating subsidiaries or own other companies. It is also apparently the case that no California industrial bank currently has operating subsidiaries or owns a company or companies whose aggregate assets exceed 10% of that bank's total assets. While this later limitation may be somewhat restrictive with respect to the growth of any existing operating subsidiary, or the addition of operating subsidiaries in the future, California's industrial banks have indicated they are prepared to work within this particular limitation.

Finally, it is important to note that those few California industrial banks currently choosing

to offer NOW accounts to individuals and charitable organizations are subject to regulations, including standard reserve requirements, promulgated by the Federal Reserve System. In permitting these industrial banks to also offer NOW accounts to business entities, H.R. 974 changes none of these requirements.

I thank the distinguished Manager for permitting me to make this clarification and for his support of fairness and equity for California's industrial banks.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I strongly oppose H.R. 974, the Small Business Checking Act of 2001, which represents an example of mixed-up budget priorities. It is particularly inappropriate to consider this extraordinarily unbalanced legislation under suspension of the rules, denying my colleagues who are not members of the Financial Services Committee an opportunity to have their concerns addressed.

I agree that the Depression-era ban on interest-bearing business checking accounts serves no public policy purpose, and I would have supported repeal of the prohibition, provided it had been accomplished in a clean bill. However, I cannot in good conscience support this bill because it contains a provision that results in a transfer of taxpayer money to a very small segment of the country's largest and most powerful depository institutions, while other budget priorities are left unfunded or underfunded.

The provision permitting the Federal Reserve banks to pay interest on the sterile reserves maintained by depository institutions in Federal Reserve Banks will result in the annual transfer of about \$100 million in real taxpayer dollars to about 1700 of the approximately 21,000 depository institutions in this country. Thirty of the largest, most powerful financial institutions will receive one-third of the interest that the Federal Reserve Banks will pay out each year.

The Administration has proposed a broad-based tax cut proposal that will consume \$2 trillion of the budget surplus. We do not know how we will pay for the President's tax cut, while meeting the other budget priorities of the Administration, addressing critical needs of the American public, paying down the debt and protecting Social Security and Medicare. Yet, the Small Business Checking Act will make the job harder by using \$1.1 billion of the surplus over ten years to provide a benefit to a very small subset of the American taxpayers. The \$1.1 billion could be put to better use by providing adequate funding for combating AIDS in Africa or restoring part of the \$2 billion in housing cuts the Administration has proposed or, even, tax relief for the average taxpayer.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHAYS). The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 66.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds of those present have voted in the affirmative.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and to include therein extraneous material on the subject of H. Con. Res. 66, the concurrent resolution just considered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12 of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 6 p.m.

Accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 8 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until approximately 6 p.m.

□ 1800

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON) at 6 p.m.

APPOINTMENT OF ADDITIONAL MEMBERS TO ATTEND FUNERAL OF THE LATE HONORABLE NORMAN SISISKY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 107, the Chair announces the additional appointment of the following Members of the House to the committee to attend the funeral of the late Norman Sisisky:

Mr. WAXMAN of California;
Mr. FROST of Texas;
Mr. SENSENBRENNER of Wisconsin;
Mr. HOYER of Maryland;
Mr. LEVIN of Michigan;
Mr. SPRATT of South Carolina;
Mr. CONDIT of California;
Mr. EDWARDS of Texas;
Mr. REYES of Texas; and
Mr. TURNER of Texas.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will now put the question on each motion to suspend the rules on which further proceedings were postponed earlier today in the order in which that motion was entertained.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

H.R. 768, by the yeas and nays;
H. Res. 91, by the yeas and nays; and
H. Res. 56, by the yeas and nays.

Votes on motions to suspend the rules on each the following measures will be taken tomorrow:

H.R. 642, by the yeas and nays; and
House Concurrent Resolution 66, by the yeas and nays.

The Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the time for any electronic vote after the first such vote in this series.

NEED-BASED EDUCATIONAL AID ACT OF 2001

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 768.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 768, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 414, nays 0, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 76]
YEAS—414

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Akin
Allen
Andrews
Armed
Baca
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Baldacci
Baldwin
Ballenger
Barcia
Barr
Barrett
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bishop
Blagojevich
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Bono
Borski
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Brown (SC)
Bryant
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Carson (IN)
Carson (OK)

Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coble
Combest
Condit
Conyers
Cooksey
Costello
Cox
Coyne
Cramer
Crane
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cubin
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Tom
Deal
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
DeLay
DeMint
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dooley
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
Engel
English
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Farr
Fattah
Ferguson
Filner
Flake
Fletcher

Foley
Ford
Fossella
Frank
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gallegly
Ganske
Gekas
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Granger
Graves
Green (TX)
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Grucci
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hansen
Harman
Hart
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hill
Hilleary
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoeffel
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooey
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inslee
Isakson

Israel
Issa
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Keller
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
Kennedy (RI)
Kerns
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
King (NY)
Kirk
Kleczka
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
LaFalce
LaHood
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Largent
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
LaTourette
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Manzullo
Markey
Mascara
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McInnis
McIntyre
McKeon
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Mica
Millender
McDonald
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary

Miller, George
Mink
Moore
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Morella
Murtha
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Oliver
Ortiz
Osborne
Ose
Otter
Owens
Oxley
Pallone
Pascarelli
Pastor
Paul
Payne
Pelosi
Pence
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Phelps
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Portman
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Rehberg
Reyes
Reynolds
Riley
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rothman
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Sabo
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sawyer
Saxton
Schaffer
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrock

Scott
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shows
Simmons
Simpson
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Souder
Spence
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stenholm
Strickland
Stump
Stupak
Sununu
Sweeney
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauscher
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Thune
Thurman
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Tierney
Toomey
Towns
Traficant
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Velazquez
Visclosky
Vitter
Walsh
Wamp
Waters
Watkins
Watt (NC)
Watts (OK)
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wexler
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson
Wu
Wynn
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—17

Becerra
Collins
Culberson
Cunningham
Hulshof
Istook
Kingston
Latham
Maloney (NY)
McKinney
Moakley
Mollohan
Rush
Scarborough
Walden
Wolf
Woolsey

□ 1824

Mr. GUTIERREZ changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof), the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 76, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for electronic voting on each additional motion to suspend the rules on which the Chair has postponed further proceedings.

EXPRESSING SENSE OF HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES REGARDING HUMAN RIGHTS IN CUBA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and agreeing to the resolution, H. Res. 91.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 91, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 347, nays 44, answered "present" 22, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 77]

YEAS—347

Abercrombie	Camp	Ehlers
Ackerman	Cannon	Ehrlich
Aderholt	Cantor	Emerson
Akin	Capito	Engel
Allen	Capps	English
Andrews	Cardin	Eshoo
Armey	Carson (IN)	Etheridge
Baca	Carson (OK)	Evans
Bachus	Chabot	Everett
Baker	Chambliss	Ferguson
Baldacci	Clement	Flake
Ballenger	Coble	Fletcher
Barr	Collins	Foley
Bartlett	Combest	Ford
Barton	Condit	Fossella
Bass	Cooksey	Frank
Bentsen	Costello	Frelinghuysen
Bereuter	Cox	Frost
Berkley	Cramer	Gallegly
Berman	Crane	Ganske
Berry	Crenshaw	Gekas
Biggert	Crowley	Gephardt
Bilirakis	Cubin	Gibbons
Blagojevich	Culberson	Gilchrest
Blunt	Davis (CA)	Gillmor
Boehlert	Davis (FL)	Gilman
Boehner	Davis, Jo Ann	Goode
Bonilla	Davis, Tom	Goodlatte
Bonior	Deal	Gordon
Bono	DeGette	Goss
Borski	DeLauro	Graham
Boswell	DeLay	Granger
Boucher	DeMint	Graves
Boyd	Deutsch	Green (TX)
Brady (PA)	Diaz-Balart	Green (WI)
Brady (TX)	Dicks	Greenwood
Brown (OH)	Dingell	Grucci
Brown (SC)	Doggett	Gutierrez
Bryant	Doolittle	Gutknecht
Burr	Doyle	Hall (OH)
Burton	Dreier	Hall (TX)
Buyer	Duncan	Hansen
Callahan	Dunn	Harman
Calvert	Edwards	Hart

Hastings (FL)	McCrery	Saxton
Hastings (WA)	McHugh	Schaffer
Hayes	McInnis	Schiff
Hayworth	McIntyre	Schrock
Hefley	McKeon	Scott
Herger	McNulty	Sensenbrenner
Hill	Meehan	Sessions
Hilleary	Meek (FL)	Shadegg
Hinojosa	Menendez	Shaw
Hobson	Mica	Shays
Hoeffel	Millender-	Sherman
Hoekstra	McDonald	Sherwood
Holden	Miller (FL)	Shimkus
Holt	Miller, Gary	Shows
Honda	Mink	Simmons
Hooley	Moore	Simpson
Horn	Moran (KS)	Skeen
Hostettler	Morella	Skelton
Houghton	Murtha	Smith (MI)
Hoyer	Myrick	Smith (NJ)
Hunter	Neal	Smith (TX)
Hutchinson	Nethercutt	Smith (WA)
Hyde	Ney	Snyder
Isakson	Northup	Solis
Israel	Norwood	Souder
Issa	Nussle	Spence
Jenkins	Ortiz	Spratt
John	Osborne	Stearns
Johnson (CT)	Ose	Stenholm
Johnson (IL)	Otter	Strickland
Johnson, E. B.	Oxley	Stump
Johnson, Sam	Pallone	Stupak
Jones (NC)	Pascarell	Sununu
Kanjorski	Pastor	Sweeney
Kaptur	Pence	Tancredo
Keller	Peterson (PA)	Tanner
Kelly	Petri	Tauscher
Kennedy (MN)	Phelps	Tauzin
Kennedy (RI)	Pickering	Taylor (MS)
Kerns	Pitts	Taylor (NC)
Kildee	Platts	Terry
Kind (WI)	Pombo	Thomas
King (NY)	Pomeroy	Thompson (CA)
Kirk	Portman	Thornberry
Knollenberg	Price (NC)	Thune
Kolbe	Pryce (OH)	Thurman
LaFalce	Putnam	Tiahrt
LaHood	Quinn	Tiberi
Langevin	Radanovich	Toomey
Lantos	Rahall	Trafficant
Largent	Ramstad	Turner
Larsen (WA)	Regula	Udall (CO)
LaTourette	Rehberg	Udall (NM)
Leach	Reyes	Upton
Levin	Reynolds	Visclosky
Lewis (CA)	Riley	Vitter
Lewis (KY)	Rivers	Walsh
Linder	Roemer	Wamp
Lipinski	Rogers (KY)	Watkins
LoBiondo	Rogers (MI)	Watts (OK)
Lofgren	Rohrabacher	Waxman
Lucas (KY)	Ros-Lehtinen	Weiner
Lucas (OK)	Ross	Weldon (FL)
Luther	Rothman	Weldon (PA)
Maloney (CT)	Roukema	Weller
Manzullo	Roybal-Allard	Wexler
Markey	Royce	Whitfield
Mascara	Ryan (WI)	Wicker
Matheson	Ryun (KS)	Wilson
Matsui	Sanchez	Wu
McCarthy (MO)	Sandlin	Young (AK)
McCarthy (NY)	Sawyer	Young (FL)

NAYS—44

Baird	Jackson (IL)	Olver
Baldwin	Jefferson	Paul
Barrett	Jones (OH)	Payne
Clay	Kilpatrick	Rangel
Clyburn	Kleczka	Sabo
Conyers	Kucinich	Sanders
Coyne	Lampson	Schakowsky
Cummings	Lee	Serrano
Dooley	Lewis (GA)	Stark
Fattah	McDermott	Thompson (MS)
Filner	McGovern	Towns
Gonzalez	Meeks (NY)	Velazquez
Hilliard	Miller, George	Waters
Hinchee	Nadler	Wynn
Inslee	Oberstar	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—22

Barcia	Delahunt	Pelosi
Bishop	Farr	Peterson (MN)
Blumenauer	Larson (CT)	Rodriguez
Brown (FL)	Lowe	Slaughter
Capuano	McCollum	Tierney
Clayton	Moran (VA)	Watt (NC)
Davis (IL)	Napolitano	
DeFazio	Owens	

NOT VOTING—18

Becerra	Kingston	Rush
Castle	Latham	Scarborough
Cunningham	Maloney (NY)	Walden
Hulshof	McKinney	Wolf
Istook	Moakley	Woolsey
Jackson-Lee (TX)	Mollohan	
	Obey	

□ 1835

Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, and Ms. VELÁZQUEZ changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. PASTOR changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

Messrs. LARSON of Connecticut, MORAN of Virginia, and DEFAZIO changed their vote from "yea" to "present."

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

URGING INTRODUCTION OF U.N. RESOLUTION CALLING UPON PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA TO END ITS HUMAN RIGHTS VIOLATIONS IN CHINA AND TIBET

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and agreeing to the resolution, H. Res. 56, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 56, as amended, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 406, nays 6, answered "present" 6, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 78]

YEAS—406

Abercrombie	Boehlert	Chambliss
Ackerman	Boehner	Clay
Aderholt	Bonilla	Clayton
Akin	Bonior	Clement
Allen	Bono	Coble
Andrews	Borski	Collins
Armey	Boswell	Combest
Baca	Boucher	Condit
Bachus	Boyd	Conyers
Baird	Brady (PA)	Cooksey
Baker	Brady (TX)	Costello
Baldacci	Brown (FL)	Cox
Baldwin	Brown (OH)	Coyne
Ballenger	Brown (SC)	Cramer
Barcia	Bryant	Crenshaw
Barr	Burr	Crowley
Barrett	Burton	Cubin
Bartlett	Buyer	Culberson
Barton	Callahan	Cummings
Bass	Calvert	Cunningham
Bentsen	Camp	Davis (CA)
Bereuter	Cannon	Davis (FL)
Berkley	Cantor	Davis (IL)
Berman	Capito	Davis, Jo Ann
Berry	Capps	Davis, Tom
Biggert	Capuano	Deal
Bilirakis	Cardin	DeFazio
Bishop	Carson (IN)	DeGette
Blagojevich	Carson (OK)	Delahunt
Blumenauer	Castle	DeLauro
Blunt	Chabot	DeLay

DeMint	Jones (OH)	Petri	Vitter	Weiner	Wicker
Deutsch	Kanjorski	Phelps	Walsh	Weldon (FL)	Wilson
Diaz-Balart	Kaptur	Pickering	Wamp	Weldon (PA)	Wu
Dicks	Keller	Pitts	Watkins	Weller	Wynn
Dingell	Kelly	Platts	Watts (OK)	Wexler	Young (AK)
Doggett	Kennedy (MN)	Pombo	Waxman	Whitfield	Young (FL)
Dooley	Kennedy (RI)	Pomeroy			
Doolittle	Kerns	Portman			
Doyle	Kildee	Price (NC)			
Dreier	Kilpatrick	Pryce (OH)	Clyburn	Hilliard	Smith (MI)
Duncan	Kind (WI)	Putnam	Hastings (FL)	Paul	Waters
Dunn	King (NY)	Quinn			
Edwards	Kirk	Radanovich			
Ehlers	Klecza	Rahall			
Ehrlich	Knollenberg	Ramstad			
Emerson	Kolbe	Rangel			
Engel	LaFalce	Regula			
English	LaHood	Rehberg			
Eshoo	Lampson	Reyes			
Etheridge	Langevin	Reynolds			
Evans	Lantos	Rivers			
Everett	Largent	Rodriguez			
Farr	Larsen (WA)	Roemer			
Fattah	Larson (CT)	Rogers (KY)			
Ferguson	LaTourette	Rogers (MI)			
Filner	Leach	Rohrabacher			
Flake	Lee	Ros-Lehtinen			
Fletcher	Levin	Ross			
Foley	Lewis (CA)	Rothman			
Ford	Lewis (GA)	Roukema			
Fossella	Lewis (KY)	Roybal-Allard			
Frank	Linder	Royce			
Frelinghuysen	Lipinski	Ryan (WI)			
Frost	LoBiondo	Ryun (KS)			
Gallegly	Lofgren	Sabo			
Ganske	Lowey	Sanchez			
Gekas	Lucas (KY)	Sanders			
Gephardt	Lucas (OK)	Sandlin			
Gibbons	Luther	Sawyer			
Gilchrest	Maloney (CT)	Saxton			
Gillmor	Maloney (NY)	Schaffer			
Gilman	Manzullo	Schiff			
Gonzalez	Markey	Schrock			
Goode	Mascara	Scott			
Goodlatte	Matheson	Sensenbrenner			
Gordon	Matsui	Serrano			
Goss	McCarthy (MO)	Sessions			
Graham	McCarthy (NY)	Shadegg			
Granger	McCollum	Shaw			
Graves	McCrery	Shays			
Green (TX)	McDermott	Sherman			
Green (WI)	McGovern	Sherwood			
Greenwood	McHugh	Shimkus			
Grucci	McInnis	Shows			
Gutierrez	McIntyre	Simmons			
Gutknecht	McKeon	Simpson			
Hall (OH)	McKinney	Skeen			
Hall (TX)	McNulty	Skelton			
Hansen	Meehan	Slaughter			
Harman	Meek (FL)	Smith (NJ)			
Hart	Meeks (NY)	Smith (TX)			
Hastings (WA)	Menendez	Smith (WA)			
Hayes	Mica	Snyder			
Hayworth	Millender	Solis			
Hefley	McDonald	Souder			
Herger	Miller (FL)	Spence			
Hill	Miller, Gary	Spratt			
Hilleary	Miller, George	Stark			
Hinojosa	Mink	Stearns			
Hobson	Moore	Stenholm			
Hoeffel	Moran (KS)	Strickland			
Hoekstra	Moran (VA)	Stump			
Holden	Morella	Stupak			
Holt	Murtha	Sununu			
Honda	Myrick	Sweeney			
Hooley	Nadler	Tancredo			
Horn	Napolitano	Tanner			
Hostettler	Neal	Tauscher			
Houghton	Nethercutt	Tauzin			
Hoyer	Ney	Taylor (MS)			
Hunter	Northup	Taylor (NC)			
Hutchinson	Norwood	Terry			
Hyde	Nussle	Thomas			
Inlee	Oberstar	Thompson (CA)			
Isakson	Obey	Thompson (MS)			
Israel	Olver	Thornberry			
Issa	Osborne	Thune			
Istook	Ose	Tiahrt			
Jackson (IL)	Otter	Tiberi			
Jackson-Lee	Owens	Tierney			
(TX)	Oxley	Toomey			
Jefferson	Pallone	Towns			
Jenkins	Pascarell	Trafficant			
John	Pastor	Turner			
Johnson (CT)	Payne	Udall (CO)			
Johnson (IL)	Pelosi	Udall (NM)			
Johnson, E. B.	Pence	Upton			
Johnson, Sam	Peterson (MN)	Velazquez			
Jones (NC)	Peterson (PA)	Visclosky			

NAYS—6

Clyburn Hilliard Smith (MI)
Hastings (FL) Paul Waters

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—6

Crane Kucinich Thurman
Hinchey Ortiz Watt (NC)

NOT VOTING—13

Becerra Mollohan Walden
Hulshof Riley Wolf
Kingston Rush Woolsey
Latham Scarborough
Moakley Schakowsky

□ 1844

Mr. KUCINICH changed his vote from "yea" to "present."

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof), the rules were suspended and the resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The title of the resolution was amended so as to read:

"A resolution strongly supporting the decision of the United States Government to offer and solicit cosponsorship for a resolution at the 57th Session of the United Nations Human Rights Commission in Geneva, Switzerland, calling upon the People's Republic of China to end its human rights abuses in China and Tibet, and for other purposes."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1845

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON FINANCIAL SERVICES TO HAVE UNTIL MIDNIGHT, TUESDAY, APRIL 17, 2001, TO FILE REPORT TO ACCOMPANY H.R. 1088

Mr. OXLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Financial Services be permitted to file the report to accompany H.R. 1088 no later than midnight, Tuesday, April 17, 2001.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

PROVIDING FOR CONDITIONAL ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE AND RECESS OR ADJOURNMENT OF THE SENATE

Mr. OXLEY. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 93), and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

H. CON. RES. 93

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That when the House adjourns on the legislative day of Wednesday, April 4, 2001, or Thursday, April 5, 2001, on a motion offered pursuant to this concurrent resolution by its Majority Leader or his designee, it stand adjourned until 2 p.m. on

Tuesday, April 24, 2001, or until noon on the second day after Members are notified to reassemble pursuant to section 2 of this concurrent resolution, whichever occurs first; and that when the Senate recesses or adjourns at the close of business on Friday, April 6, 2001, Saturday, April 7, 2001, Sunday, April 8, 2001, or Monday, April 9, 2001, on a motion offered pursuant to this concurrent resolution by its Majority Leader or his designee, it stand recessed or adjourned until noon on Monday, April 23, 2001, or until such time on that day as may be specified by its Majority Leader or his designee in the motion to recess or adjourn, or until noon on the second day after Members are notified to reassemble pursuant to section 2 of this concurrent resolution, whichever occurs first.

Sec. 2. The Speaker of the House and the Majority Leader of the Senate, acting jointly after consultation with the Minority Leader of the House and the Minority Leader of the Senate, shall notify the Members of the House and the Senate, respectively, to reassemble whenever, in their opinion, the public interest shall warrant it.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 1193

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 1193.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 933

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 933.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will entertain 1-minutes.

ODE TO DUKE UNIVERSITY BLUE DEVILS

(Mr. PRICE of North Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, last night, Duke University from the 4th Congressional District of North Carolina was crowned the national champion after the victory over the Arizona Wildcats 82-72 in the Final Four, the king of the NCAA.

This is the first national championship for Duke since 1992. It is the third in their history, and we are as proud as we can be. But tonight, Mr. Speaker, we are not going to be hearing from me.

We are going to be hearing from a couple of fine colleagues with whom I

had an agreement going into this Final Four and who will be all too happy, I am sure, to don the Duke jersey and the Duke cap, and to read a script which they have agreed to deliver in homage to the Duke Blue Devils and their national championship.

Let me say, before I yield to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), that Duke in this path to the national championship met not just Arizona, but the University of Maryland in the semifinal, University of Southern California, UCLA, University of Missouri, and Monmouth.

We are the adversaries of all. We are as proud as we can be.

Mr. Speaker, I am very proud to yield to the gentleman from College Park, Maryland (Mr. HOYER), my friend and colleague.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my remarks be expunged from the record as soon as they are made.

Mr. Speaker, but for the fact that the rules prohibit it, I would wear this jersey during the course of my remarks; but our Parliamentarian would have a heart attack and think that I had stepped egregiously on the rules. So only because the parliamentarian wants me to take off the Duke shirt do I do so. But I will hold it up.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair appreciates the gentleman's cooperation.

Mr. HOYER. I thank you, Mr. Speaker. I will put my jacket back on. I cannot be totally inoffensive.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will put his jacket back on.

Mr. HOYER. I will put the jacket back on. The gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HAYES), my friend, is helping me with my jacket, who is a graduate of Duke. All the Dukes are pretty gracious tonight. They were not very gracious last Saturday night I noticed.

Mr. Speaker, I humbly rise to deliver an ode to the Duke Blue Devils, college basketball 2001 national champions.

Only one team during the course of the season beat Duke by more than 10 points, the mighty Maryland Terrapins. Unfortunately, it was not Saturday night.

The Duke Blue Devils are champions worthy of the name. They proved it again and again in game after game. But before they could play for the title last night, the Dukies had to get through a Saturday night fright.

The Maryland Terrapins, new to the Final Four, came out of the blocks like they wanted much more. Determined not to fall short to the Blue Devils again, my Terps were as ferocious as a lion guarding her den.

Duke was down 22 points and flat on their backs, 11 at the half, but lo and behold, a comeback was hatched. As the game wore on, the Blue Devils would not quit, and for Maryland's Cinderella season, the slipper no longer fit. But the Blue Devils were not finished; they had not cleared the field.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. KOLBE. By Monday night, Duke had beaten Monmouth and Mizzou. They had sent home the Bruins, the Trojans and the Terrapins, too. The time had come to battle our beloved 'Cats. The final game would determine to whom we would tip our hats.

Duke came from the East and Arizona rode in from the West for a final Minneapolis shoot-out to answer who is best. The Devils showed that they were up for the fight, and the question of who is best was answered last night.

We watched the joyous Blue Devils cut down the net, and I thought to myself why did I make this bet?

Arizona, Maryland, and the rest of our teams are left thinking of next year and dreaming championship dreams. For now, the Blue Devils wear the crown, they can celebrate a great victory as the toast of the town.

Mr. HOYER. Here, here.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) and the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE) and congratulate all of these teams. These were wonderful games, hard fought; and we are very proud to have survived this Final Four.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from the Eighth District of North Carolina (Mr. HAYES), a Duke alumnus.

Mr. HAYES. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE) lives in Chapel Hill. We defeated the dreaded Tar Heels several times on the way to this victory.

I say to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), we are not gloating here. We are just here saying how proud we are of those young men, the coaching staff, the students and others.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I want to rise a little bit in seriousness and say how proud we are, those of us who were in the ACC, of Duke's magnificent victory, not in derogation of Arizona, a great team itself, but my, my, my, how Duke plays, how Coach Krzyzewski coaches, and the fire that they showed.

I said during the ditty that I was forced to go through, that they were down by 22, and it is because of the character, the heart, the courage and, yes, the extraordinary ability of the Duke players that they came back and prevailed in that game on Saturday night.

I know the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE) joins me in congratulating the Duke players, the Duke coach, and Duke itself for a magnificent and winning effort.

Mr. HAYES. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) and the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE) and to our Duke Blue Devils who exhibited team work,

sportsmanship, scholarship and a family of young men and women working together that achieved remarkable things.

Congratulations to the Blue Devils.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TIBERI). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

REGARDING THE RE-REGULATION OF THE AIRLINE INDUSTRY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LIPINSKI) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, before I get into my Special Order, since the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) is still here, I simply want to say that the reason the Duke Blue Devils won the NCAA championship is because the referees managed to foul out almost every Big 10 player that was in the tournament, and the second reason is the fact that the coach of the Blue Devils happens to be of Polish-American heritage from the city of Chicago.

American Airlines' acquisition of TWA, which declared bankruptcy in January, is nearly complete. The American-TWA transaction was approved in March by a U.S. bankruptcy court judge. The Department of Justice issued a statement declaring that the agency would not challenge the merger, in essence, approving it.

The Department of Transportation is currently working on the transfer of TWA's certificates and international routes to American Airlines. Although American Airlines must still survive some legal challenges during the bankruptcy appeals process, and, more importantly, gain approval from its unions, it will, by the end of this month, acquire 190 TWA planes, 175 TWA gates at airports throughout the Nation, 173 TWA slots at the four slot-controlled airports, TWA's hub in St. Louis, and 20,000 TWA employees.

As a result, American Airlines will now enjoy the title of the world's largest airline with a 20 percent share of the U.S. domestic market.

Unfortunately, American Airlines' quest to become bigger does not end there. American Airlines has also joined in the fray of the proposed United-US Airways merger.

Last summer, United Airlines announced plans to purchase US Airways for a total of \$11.6 billion. Now American Airlines plans to pay United Airlines \$1.2 billion for 20 percent of the US Airways' assets, which includes 86 jets and 14 gates at six East Coast airports.

□ 1900

As part of the deal, American and United would join together to operate

the highly lucrative shuttle routes between Washington, D.C., New York, and Boston, which are now operated by US Airways. In addition, American Airlines is willing to pay \$82 million for a 49 percent stake in DCAir, the airline created to allay antitrust concerns about the proposed United-US Airways merger. DCAir plans to take over most of US Airways' operation at Reagan Washington National Airport.

If approved, United Airlines and its arch rival, American Airlines, will control half of the U.S. air travel market. Delta Airlines, United and America's next biggest competitor, will be left behind with only 18 percent of the domestic U.S. market.

In response to this unprecedented consolidation of the airline industry, the CEO of the low-fare airline AirTran called the proposed merger one of the most brazen attempts by any two dominant businesses in any industry to simply accomplish together what they so vigorously resisted in recent years, the reregulation of the airline industry. However, instead of the Federal Government doling out routes and dividing up airport assets, it is the airlines themselves that are gobbling up their weaker rivals and carving up the Nation.

With new hubs in Charlotte, Pittsburgh and Philadelphia to complement the existing operation at Washington-Dulles, United will rule the eastern seaboard in a proposed merger era. American will dominate the Midwest with the addition of St. Louis to its hubs at Dallas-Fort Worth and Chicago O'Hare. American will also have a significant presence at Reagan Washington National and New York's Kennedy airports.

Faced with this tremendous market power possessed by a combined United-US Airways and a combined American-TWA-US Airways, the remaining network carriers, namely Delta Airlines, Northwest Airlines and Continental, will have to merge in some fashion to survive. This is the only way that they can acquire the size and scale necessary to compete in a rapidly consolidating industry. Therefore, in a postmerger era, it will not be two megacarriers dividing up half of the U.S. market, but, rather, three or four megacarriers controlling 80 percent of the U.S. market.

Low-fare carriers will have to compete vigorously for the remaining 20 percent. This is, of course, if the megacarriers allow them to survive. Even today, when competition supposedly is alive and well, major carriers use their power to frustrate new entrant carriers and drive smaller competitors out of their established hubs.

The major carriers use everything in their power, including airplane capacity, airport assets, and frequent flier programs, to squash competition from low-fare, new entrant airlines. Yet, the major carriers do not vigorously compete with one another. The U.S. Department of Transportation (DOT) found that major network airlines have raised fares the most in

markets where they compete only with one another. When they are forced to compete against a low-fare carrier, prices have not risen nearly as much. In fact, according to the DOT, in a market lacking a discount competitor, 24.7 million passengers per day pay on average 41 percent more than their counterparts in a hub market with a low-fare competitor.

Three mega-carriers will have mega-market power and even more tools to drive out and keep out new competition. And, if six major carriers do not compete against each other today, why would three mega-carriers compete against each other in a post-merger tomorrow? Therefore, if the U.S. airline industry is allowed to consolidate, we will be left with essentially a re-regulated airline industry where the airlines call the shots and set the fares. With so few choices, airlines would have a captive consumer. Customer service would decline—if that is even possible given the level it is at today—and fares would increase. It's a lose-lose situation for customers. In that case, the federal government will have no choice but to step in and, in the public interest, assume its role as regulator. That's right. I firmly believe that if there are only three or four mega-carriers serving the U.S. market, the federal government will once again have to regulate the airline industry—overseeing fares, routes, and access to airports—in order to ensure a healthy state of competition.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 8, DEATH TAX ELIMINATION ACT OF 2001

Mr. REYNOLDS, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 107-39) on the resolution (H. Res. 111) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 8) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to phaseout the estate and gift taxes over a 10-year period, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TIBERI). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BILIRAKIS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. BILIRAKIS addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extension of Remarks.)

EQUAL PAY DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, just a few minutes ago I was here in jest and in honoring the Duke team. I want to speak on a very serious subject at this point in time.

It is just days after the end of Women's History Month and just weeks before millions of Americans will collectively honor their mothers on Mother's Day. Both events are borne out of the

great respect and admiration we have for the women who have so strengthened our Nation, our society, and our families. Yet even today, Mr. Speaker, we must face up to this reality: American women earned only 72 cents for every dollar that men earned in 1999 for equal and comparable work, according to the latest report from the Bureau of Labor Statistics. And that, Mr. Speaker, is a drop of 1 cent from 1998. Put another way, that 72-cent figure means that today, Tuesday, April 3, is the day on which women's wages catch up to men's wages from the previous week. It takes women 7 working days to earn what men earn in 5.

This gender wage gap exists even when men and women have the same occupation, race, and experience; are employed in the same industry, in the same region, and are working for firms of equal size. But here, Mr. Speaker, is what it means in real terms. Each week it means that women, on average, have \$28 less to spend on groceries, housing, child care, and other expenses for every \$100 of work they do. Each month it means that women, on average, work 1 week for free. And over the course of a lifetime, it means that the average 25-year-old woman will lose more than \$5 million due to the wage gap. Let me repeat that: During their working lives, women will, on average, lose \$5 million because of the unfair wage gap.

The wage gap is even larger for women of color. African American women are paid only 65 cents for every dollar earned by a man, and Hispanic women make only 52 cents for every dollar earned by a man.

Yes, our Nation has made great strides in gender equality. In 1979, for example, women earned only 63 cents for every dollar men earned. But the wage disparity that exists in our society continues, and it is simply unacceptable. It is wrong.

I speak not only as a legislator, but as the father of three daughters and the grandfather of two granddaughters. Bella Abzug, a leader in the fight for women's equality and a former Member of this House, once remarked, and I quote, "The test for whether or not you can hold a job should not be the arrangement of your chromosomes." We must apply that same test with equal vigor on the issue of fair pay. If you can do your job, there must be no question that you will receive fair pay for your labor.

This issue, after all, is not strictly a woman's issue. It is an issue that strikes at the heart of family finances and fairness. Unequal pay robs entire families of economic security. More women than ever are in the work force today, and their wages are essential in supporting their families. Sixty-four percent of working women provide half or more of their family's income, according to a 1997 study by the AFL-CIO. And the wage gap costs the average American family approximately \$4,000 each year.

Mr. Speaker, we talked about giving their money back to them, the taxpayers. That is an appropriate subject for us to discuss. But it is also clear that paying equal wages to our women workers would be a better benefit for them. So despite the fact that equal pay has been the law since the passage of the Equal Pay Act of 1963 and the Civil Rights Act of 1964, we still have a long way to go.

That is why I have cosponsored, Mr. Speaker, and urge my colleagues to support, H.R. 781, the bipartisan Paycheck Fairness Act. This legislation would toughen the Equal Pay Act, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. GRUCCI) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. GRUCCI addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

ENVIRONMENTALISTS ARE HURTING POOR AND WORKING PEOPLE OF THIS COUNTRY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago it was announced that California utility rates were going up 50 percent on top of an earlier 10 percent increase. Is this a sign of things to come for the rest of the Nation? Already people all over the country have seen their utility bills go up significantly in recent months.

Also, a few days ago it was reported that OPEC has voted to cut oil production by a million barrels a day, and that our gas prices are going to greatly increase this summer. The Air Transport Association told me a few months ago that each 1 cent increase in jet fuel costs the aviation industry \$200 million. Thus, if oil goes up even just a little more, airline tickets will have to go up, forcing huge numbers more onto our highways, which are hundreds of times more dangerous than flying.

Who is responsible for all this? We can thank environmental extremists, who almost always seem to come from wealthy families, and who are not really hurt if prices go up on everything. In California they have protested and have kept any new power plants from being built for many years despite greatly increased demand produced by the Internet and population growth.

All over this country, though, we have groups of environmentalists protesting any time anyone wants to dig for any coal, drill for any oil, cut any trees, or produce any natural gas. This has driven up prices for everything and has destroyed jobs and has hurt the poor and those on fixed incomes the most. It has hurt truckers and farmers, and has driven many of our manufacturing jobs to other countries.

The current issue of Consumers' Research Magazine has an article entitled, "Why Natural Gas Problems Loom," by an editorial writer for USA Today. Listen to parts of this article. "The problem is that the same government pushing natural gas demand is also keeping vast stocks of it essentially bottled up underground through tight and sometimes absolute restrictions on what can be done on the land and sea above. Two hundred thirteen trillion cubic feet of natural gas are off limits to drillers, thanks to a vast web of regulations and moratoria on drilling. The reason for all this is simple," the article says. It says, "Environmentalists and preservationists have long pressured government to restrict or ban drillers. President Clinton, shortly before leaving office, took still more supplies away through his national monument declarations."

Some of these environmental groups, Sierra Club, Earth First, and others, have gone so far to the left that they make even Socialists look conservative. They are really hurting the working people by destroying so many good jobs and driving up prices at the same time. They tell former loggers and coal miners and others not to worry, that they can retrain them for jobs in the tourist industry; ecotourism. But who in his right mind wants to give up a \$15- or \$20-an-hour job for one paying barely above minimum wage, which is what most tourism jobs pay.

These radicals hurt most the very people they claim to help, and help most the big corporations they claim to be against. In the late 1970s, we had 157 small coal companies in east Tennessee. Now we have five. What happened? Well, we had an office of the Federal Government, OSM, open up in Knoxville. First, they drove all the small companies out, then the medium-sized companies were next. Federal rules, regulations, and red tape hurt small businesses and small farms the most. Big government really helps only extremely big business and the bureaucrats who work for the government.

Mr. Speaker, I chaired the Subcommittee on Aviation for 6 years. Environmental rules and regulations have caused runway and other airport projects to take sometimes 10 or even 20 years to complete, projects that could have been done in 2 or 3 years. This has caused the cost of air travel to be much higher than it would have been, and has caused many of the delayed flights we have today.

When I talk about the higher utility bills and all the lost jobs that environmental extremists have caused, nothing could potentially cause more harm to working people and lower-income families than the Kyoto agreement. There are not words adequate enough to thank President Bush for his courage in stopping this economic disaster from hitting this Nation. Our economy started slowing dramatically last June,

according to the Christian Science Monitor, a liberal newspaper. This was 7 months before President Bush took office. To enforce this Kyoto agreement at a time of economic slowdown would run the risk of putting us in near depression conditions.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, when people see their utility bills shoot up, when gas prices go higher, when homes and every other product made from trees cost twice what they should, they can thank the environmentalists.

□ 1915

We have made great progress over the last 25 or 30 years with our air and water, but some of these groups do not want people to hear good things about the environment because their contributions would dry up.

The really sad thing, Mr. Speaker, is that this is all about big money. Poor and working people are being hurt so environmentalists can scare people and get more contributions. And companies which benefit if we import more oil, OPEC countries, shipping companies and others, contribute to these groups so we will have to import more products which are made from natural resources. It is really sad what environmentalists are doing to the poor and working people in this country.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TIBERI). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. BROWN addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

A NEW DECLARATION OF ECONOMIC INDEPENDENCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, America needs a new declaration of economic independence: Freedom, justice, opportunity. These are the values that our parents, grandparents, and forebears lived and died for. These are the values that prompt young men and women to give themselves to military and public service. These are the values that reflect the highest ideals of our country and what America has historically offered to the world.

Thus, last week's debate on taxes, the first major economic debate of the 21st century and of the new Presidency, disappointed me greatly. The debate should have centered on what is the wisest economic course of action for the sustenance of our republic. But the debate basically boiled down to what every American can take for himself or herself. The President went around the country divisively and derisively saying, "It's not the government's money; it's your money." Except for one thing: We, the American people, are the government. His rhetoric appealed to the

most selfish instincts imaginable; and his proposals are proving he is headed towards government of the rich, by the rich, and for the rich.

Contrast his base appeal with that of President John F. Kennedy who once summoned Americans to ask not what your country can do for you but what you can do for your country, and what we together can do for the freedom of humankind.

Mr. Speaker, I urge our colleagues in the other body to choose a wiser economic course than the House and the President, a prudent course, a responsible course for our Nation's future. We should not imperil our Nation's economic growth through reckless tax cuts. America should first pay its bills.

The facts are that the interest payments alone on America's \$5.5 trillion debt account for an ever-increasing percentage of the annual budget.

Look at this chart. This shows since 1975, interest payments on our national debt have grown every year. This is the year 2000 right here, highest ever, and projected this year, over \$434 billion of interest payments alone on the debt. So what is all this talk about this magic surplus? And think about how these interest payments crowd out other important national investments we could be making, in Social Security and Medicare, where we must pay those bills, in defense and education, in veterans benefits, in transportation, in the environment and certainly in agriculture.

In the 1990s, due to unparalleled economic growth and strong budget discipline by Members of this House, we began to turn our ship of state around in the proper direction by finally beginning to get our bills paid. But I urge anyone to go to the U.S. Department of Treasury Web site and see for yourselves what America still owes. Here is the Web site number right up here, <http://publicdebt.treas.gov>.

Let me point out also that the percentage of foreign holders of the Federal debt has tripled since I was a freshman on the Banking Committee, going from 12 percent of what is being bought by others today to a resounding 41 percent. The largest investor in the U.S. Federal debt is now Japan, holding over \$340 billion. Do you have any question in your mind why our products cannot gain fair access to Japan's markets when she is holding the purse strings?

Something has gone terribly, terribly wrong with our economic policies. In fact, interest on our debt now exceeds more than we pay in an annual year for the defense of this Nation. It is double what we spend annually on Medicaid and Medicare. And it dwarfs critical spending in other nondefense areas like education, transportation, veterans, agriculture, all put together into one.

I wanted to add to that our trade deficit. Every single year over the last 20 years, America's trade deficit with the world has deepened to historically all-time levels. Almost \$500 billion more

imports coming into this country on an annual basis than our exports going out. And you ask yourself who is now the largest holder of these private dollars related to goods trade with America? I can tell you it is the People's Republic of China, which is far from my definition of a republic, with over \$80 billion of holdings in U.S. dollar reserves.

So what is wrong with the Bush plan? Tomorrow night I am going to continue on that, but let me first say that the President's tax and budget plan ought to lead to paying down our debt and ushering in a new era of economic independence for our country.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Maryland (Mrs. MORELLA) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mrs. MORELLA addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

IN MEMORIAM: MRS. NOLA BRIGHT, IMMEDIATE PAST PRESIDENT, WESTSIDE BRANCH NAACP

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, today is equal pay day for women. I take this time to stop and pay tribute to a woman who spent practically all of her adult life fighting in behalf of women, minorities and any others whom she felt may have been oppressed and at the bottom of the socioeconomic ladder, Mrs. Nola Bright, immediate past president of the Westside Branch NAACP.

Nola Bright was born and reared in the city of Chicago and spent the major portion of her life living in, defending and working to improve what is commonly and affectionately known as the West Side of Chicago, in the Lawndale community.

Nola Bright was a family-oriented person. She grew up in a warm family, married John Bright at an early age, and had four children. She was a fiercely dedicated mother and grandmother and was indeed a surrogate mother, mentor and role model for many younger men, women and children who looked to her for guidance and direction.

Nola Bright became a school and community activist at an early age. As she saw her children off to school, she started to work with the Chicago Youth Centers as a way of making sure that children had after-school recreation and leisure-time activities. Mrs. Bright came into her own during the mid-1960s which was a period of great civil unrest, social change and the establishment of new structures. She was intimately immersed in all of these activities and often rose to leadership status within the groups with whom she worked.

She worked most directly with the Chicago Youth Centers, Better Boys Foundation, District 8 Education Council, Greater Lawndale Conservation Commission, Sears, YMCA, Martin Luther King Neighborhood Health Center, Lawndale Urban Progress Center and the Model Cities Program.

Nola Bright was a champion of the underdog and spent much of her life working with and on behalf of individuals and causes often considered to be the least popular. Rarely did Nola Bright separate her compensated work from her causes. You generally could not distinguish between her job and her volunteer activity. Over the years, she held a variety of jobs, Chicago Youth Centers, Martin Luther King Neighborhood Health Center, Westside Association for Community Action's Sickle Cell Project. She even worked for me when I was a member of the Chicago City Council and president pro tem. Finally, she worked for Habilitative Systems Social Service Agency from which she retired.

For the past 20 years or more of her life, Nola Bright was totally committed to keeping the Westside Branch of the NAACP alive and functioning. She served as president, secretary, treasurer, membership chairman and held every other office. She performed any and all tasks that she could not get someone else to do. Nola Bright was stubbornly principled and would much rather give out than give in. In actuality, she gave her life to the service of others.

She will be memorialized at the Carey Tercentenary AME Church on Saturday, April 6, 2001, 10 a.m., still looking for equal pay, for equal justice and equal opportunity.

REGARDING THE MIDDLE EAST

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, before I make my formal remarks, let me indicate that today I filed H.R. 1336, to give citizenship to the held Chinese citizen, legal resident of the United States, professor in the United States, mother of a 5-year-old and now husband to a United States citizen held in China for now almost 2 months.

I am very pleased that this private citizenship bill is cosponsored by myself, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE), the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS), the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD), the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE), the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY), the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE), the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. KENNEDY), and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF).

It is a tragedy when families are separated. If we can do anything to enhance the role of the United States of

America to promote peace and democracy and to ease the pain of a family that has now been separated, distressed and in great frustration, this House should move on this legislation immediately. I call on my colleagues to sign this legislation to create this citizenship for this imprisoned member of this country and as well to provide solace to her family, her husband and her child.

Mr. Speaker, however, I rise today to speak on the Mideast conflict. Peace is never easy to broker. Prime Minister Sharon of Israel has a formidable task ahead of him. We need to forge ahead as an international community to help bring further stability to the Middle East. As Winston Churchill once said, "We shall not escape our dangers by recoiling from them."

Since the Middle East conflict began anew last fall, 457 people have been killed, including 375 Palestinians, 63 Israeli Jews, and 19 others. With both sides accusing each other of unjustified attacks, there sometimes appears to be no end in sight for the terror affecting the children of the Middle East. It remains a fact, Mr. Speaker, that nongovernmental organizations like Save the Children have begun distribution of emergency medical supplies to five hospitals in the territories. Save the Children has worked to bring medical supplies to the Union of Palestinian Medical Relief Committees and the Medical Services, the operation of ambulance services with the Palestinian Red Crescent, the rehabilitation of schools and teacher training so that children have a creative, productive way to channel their energies. This is necessary to respond quickly to the special needs of children caught in the current uprising. And America must do more to assist such ongoing efforts and more to assist in the brokering of peace.

Whatever happens, there can be little doubt that relations between Israelis and Palestinians will have a profound impact on United States strategic interests in the Middle East. And because of that, the United States must remain an interested party in the region. It is absolutely imperative.

As the President of Egypt now visits America, the Bush administration must work to explore new opportunities for peace and reconciliation in the Middle East. We cannot recoil, we cannot be a turtle, we cannot stick our heads in the sand. America must become more engaged regarding negotiations between the Israelis and the Palestinians. Unfortunately, America has been silent since the departure of the former administration concerning a dangerous situation that cannot be resolved without its constructive participation.

□ 1930

Am I suggesting that we engage in war, Mr. Speaker? No, I am not. I am simply asking us to help.

Too many children stand to lose their lives and stand to lose without

our help. I believe that it is critical that both parties need to make every effort to end the current cycle of provocation and reaction. Each side bears a special responsibility to seek an end for the riots, the terror, the bombings and the shootings. There must be a time-out on violence before the situation degenerates into war that we cannot stop.

We can all remember the images from last fall of the Palestinian child hiding behind his father caught in the crossfire shot to death; and then the images a few days later, the pictures of an Israeli soldier who was beaten while in custody and thrown out of a second floor window of a police station to be beaten to death by the mob below. We must stop this travesty.

It is easy to understand how passions can run high and frustration and fear can drive violence, but it is also easy to see how these feelings, even these feelings that are based in legitimate aspiration, can get out of control and lead to ever-deeper and never-ending cycles of violence. When will it end?

The children, Israeli and Palestinians, are the targets of increasing hatred that they simply do not understand. We must have respect, Mr. Speaker, for the peace and the necessity of moving forward.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, let me just say that it is important to follow the words of Robert F. Kennedy: "It is when expectations replace submission, when despair is touched with the awareness of possibility, that the forces of human desire and the passion for justice are unloosed."

We must unloose it in the Mideast. We must fight for peace.

Mr. Speaker, peace is never easy to broker. Prime Minister Sharon of Israel has a formidable task ahead of him, and we need to forge ahead as an international community to help bring further stability to the Middle East. As Winston Churchill once said, "We shall not escape our dangers by recoiling from them."

Since the Mideast conflict began last fall, 457 people have been killed, including 375 Palestinians, 63 Israeli Jews and 19 others. With both sides accusing each other of unjustified attacks, there sometimes appears to be no end in sight for the terror affecting the children of the Middle East. It remains a fact, Mr. Speaker, that nongovernmental organizations like Save the Children have begun distribution of emergency medical supplies to five hospitals in the territories. Save the Children has worked to bring medical supplies for the Union of Palestinian Medical Relief Committees and the Medical Services, the operation of ambulance services with the Palestinian Red Crescent, the rehabilitation of schools and teacher training so children have creative, productive ways to channel their energies. This is necessary to respond quickly to the special needs of children caught in the current uprising, and America must do more to assist such ongoing efforts.

Whatever happens, there can be little doubt that relations between Israelis and Palestinians will have a profound impact on United States strategic interests in the Middle East. And because of that, the United States must remain an interested party in the region.

As President Hosni Mubarak now visits America from Egypt, the Bush administration must work to explore new opportunities for peace and reconciliation in the Middle East. America must become more engaged regarding negotiations between the Israelis and the Palestinians. Unfortunately, America has been silent since the departure of the former administration concerning a dangerous situation that cannot be resolved without its constructive participation. Too many children stand to lose without our help, Mr. Speaker.

I believe that it is critical that both parties need to make every effort to end the current cycle of provocation and reaction. Each side bears a special responsibility to seek an end to the riots, the terror, the bombings, and the shootings. There must be a "time out" on violence before the situation degenerates further into war. We can all remember the images, from last fall, of the Palestinian child hiding behind his father, caught in the cross-fire, shot to death, and then the images, a few days later, the pictures of the Israeli soldier who was beaten while in custody and thrown out of a second floor window of the police station, to be beaten to death by the mob below.

It is easy to understand how passions can run high, and frustration and fear can drive violence. But it is also easy to see how these feelings—even these feelings, that are based in legitimate aspiration—can get out of control and lead to ever deeper, and never-ending, cycles of violence. The children, especially the young, are targets of increasing hatred that they simply do not understand.

If both Israel and the Palestinians can make progress in curbing or ending the violence, the United States can play an important role in helping to shape intermediate confidence-building measures between Israel and the Palestinians. The current environment makes a comprehensive agreement very difficult indeed, but proximity gives the Israelis and the Palestinians no choice but to learn to live together. The alternative is clearly war.

The children of Israel and the Palestinian Authority are not expendable; they are the casualties of intolerable violence. The United States must continue to work together with both Israel and the Palestinian Authority to enhance security in the region.

America can play a decisive role in fostering peace and stability in the Middle East. The Bush administration must respond more effectively in the peace process. We should not take sides in this lengthy conflict. However, the United States bears an unquestionable obligation to maintain a constructive role in the Middle East peace process.

The larger question of a lasting peace in the region is, of course, predicated on facilitating continued negotiations with the Palestinians. I will always be a strong supporter of the Middle East peace process because we can never stop trying. We struggle for peace, Mr. Speaker, because the current wave of violence is unacceptable. It undermines the very basis for peace, the notion that Palestinians and Israelis can trust each other and live together.

Last year, we edged a little closer to establishing a permanent blueprint for peace between the Israelis and Palestinians at Wye River. While a peace agreement did not come to fruition, the Israelis and Palestinians conducted an unprecedented level of negotiations in the pursuit of a permanent peace. They discussed issues and exchanged viewpoints on

pivotal matters of dire meaning to the Israeli people and the Palestinian people.

Mr. Speaker, we don't really know when all parties to this ongoing conflict will find everlasting peace and reconciliation. We do know, however, that Chairman Yasser Arafat of the Palestinian Liberation Organization and Prime Minister Sharon of Israel have an acute sense of the high stakes involved.

Mr. Speaker, let me close with an admonition by Robert F. Kennedy in a 1966 speech made at the University of California. "Men without hope, resigned to despair and oppression, do not have to make revolutions. It is when expectations replaces submission, when despair is touched with the awareness of possibility, that the forces of human desire and the passion for justice are unloosed." The recent violence in the Middle East only underscores the need to get the peace process back on track. We must do so expeditiously for the sake of the children.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TIBERI). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. PALLONE addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. LANGEVIN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. LANGEVIN addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia (Ms. MCKINNEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. MCKINNEY addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

REMEMBERING ROBERT B. GANLEY, CITY MANAGER OF PORTLAND, MAINE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Maine (Mr. ALLEN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to remember Robert B. Ganley, for 14 years the city manager of Portland, Maine, who died suddenly from a heart attack on Saturday, December 23, 2000. He was 51.

Bob Ganley preached substance over style, and that is how he lived. As city manager first of South Portland and then of Portland, he revitalized our communities. A master of the budgetary process, he made local government more efficient, improved services, held down taxes, and made Portland a better place to live.

His sometimes blunt demeanor could not hide a passionate commitment to his city, his family, the Portland Sea Dogs and Boston sports teams.

Bob might have become a journalist, but as he told a friend who was one, "I loved government." Not many today

understand the depth of his kind of commitment to public service.

For 6 years, from 1989 to 1995, I served on the Portland City Council, including one year as mayor. I learned from Bob the importance of fighting for the long-term interests of a community against the negative passions of the moment.

Bob Ganley knew that his job was to strengthen the community he served. He wanted Portland to be a place where people cared about each other and could work effectively together toward goals that transcended their individual interests. Portland today is that kind of community.

When homeless people were sleeping in city parks in the late 1980s, Bob pushed the shelter program to meet his declared goal that no one would be without a bed in Portland. He succeeded.

When the local economy stalled in the early 1990s, Bob helped create a downtown improvement district, pushed through tax increment financing packages, and established a business advisory committee to connect city hall with downtown businesses. He worked closely with our employee unions to cope with unusual budgetary pressures.

Bob seized opportunities. When Portland was offered the chance to host the AA baseball team, Bob made it happen and became one of the biggest fans of the Portland Sea Dogs. He understood what the team would do to lift the spirit of the city, even though the economic impact could never be calculated.

Bob Ganley's management style was defined by his unwavering public support of the men and women who worked for the city. He had high expectations for his staff and they knew it. He nudged and pushed and challenged them; but in public he always defended them, even if he thought they were mistaken. Critiques were reserved for private meetings. Above all, Bob could make decisions. We can do this, he would say, about some difficult undertaking, and his staff and the council went out and did it.

When Bob died on December 23, he left behind three children. His pride in them was evident to all who knew him because if he was not talking about the city or sports, he was telling friends about his kids. He had reason to be proud of his children, Amy, Jillian, and Robert, Jr., all now young adults. Their mother, Susan, is helping them adjust to their loss.

At Bob's memorial service in the Merrill Auditorium at city hall, his son Bobby said, "Thank you, Dad, for teaching me that life is all about substance and not about style." He captured his father's character, as well as his passion for public service.

Bob's own life was about to change. He had proposed to Tracy Sullivan less than 24 hours before he died. Tracy's sadness after so much joy is profoundly felt by all who know her. Her young son, Dimitri, loved Bob, too. His

friends, family, and colleagues all miss Bob Ganley; but we take heart from his example, for he showed us how to brush aside cynics and lead the citizens of Portland to build together a better place to live.

Thank you, Bob, for all you taught us.

WOMEN DESERVE EQUAL PAY FOR EQUAL WORK

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. BACA) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BACA. Mr. Speaker, when President John Kennedy signed the Equal Pay Act into law on June 10, 1963, women on the average earned 61 cents for each dollar earned by a man.

Today, working women earn 73 cents for every dollar earned by a man, according to the Bureau of Labor Statistics.

President Kennedy told his fellow citizens that he was taking the first step in addressing the unconscionable practice of paying female employees less wages than male employees for the same job.

While progress has been made, still more needs to be done. If Congress acts this year, more can be achieved; and I say more can be achieved and will be achieved if we come together.

In my State of California, families lose a staggering \$21 billion of income annually to the wage gap. If women in California received equal pay, poverty and single-mom households would go from 19.2 percent to 9.2 percent.

Women in the Inland Empire, for example, lose an average of \$4,000 every year because of unequal pay, and I state because of unequal pay they lose that much; that is \$4,000. This is money that cannot buy groceries, housing, child care, clothing for their families, and we must realize how important and critical it is when someone has to budget their dollars based on the amount of monies that they get paid.

I ask my colleagues to support H.R. 781, the Paycheck Fairness Act, and the Fair Pay Act legislation currently pending in Congress that is designed to help eliminate the wage gap that still exists between men and women.

Many working women lack the basic benefits they need in order to care for their families. They are our grandmothers, our mothers, our wives, our sisters, our daughters, and our colleagues. They are doctors, lawyers, teachers, caregivers, and leaders.

Women lawyers earn \$3,000 less than a male attorney, and a lot of people are surprised and they think that they earn an equal amount of pay and they do not.

Female doctors make \$5,000 less than male colleagues.

Wages for female nurses, where 95 percent are women, earn \$30 less each week than male nurses who make up 5 percent. Can one imagine, only 5 percent are male and the majority, which

is 95 percent female, earn less money. That is not fair.

Waitresses' weekly earnings are \$50 less than waiters' earnings.

The situation is even worse for women of color. African American women earn only 67 cents and Latinos 56 cents for every dollar that men earn. This continues to be a disparity, and a lot of times when we look at our Nation and we look at the diversity that we have, all we are asking for is for equal pay for equal work; that African American women and Latinos should earn the same amount of dollars that anybody else should earn because they are willing to work and they are not asking for any special privileges. They are saying pay me for the same work that somebody else earns.

The wage gap impacts women's retirement also. Women have less to save for the future and will earn smaller pensions than men; and when we look at today's society, it is no longer a man that is providing but a woman a lot of times is providing for the family.

It is important that they also have that security for retirement when they are looking towards retirement.

On the job, working women are looking for higher pay, better benefits and, most of all, the three Rs, and I state the three Rs: respect, recognition, and reward for a job well done. We all need a pat on the back, and we all need to be respected when it comes to that recognition.

Half of all older women receiving a pension in 1998 got less than \$3,486 per year compared to \$7,020 per year for older men.

Before the end of the year, let us pass this legislation to finally make the work of America's women valued, fair, equitable, and just. Let us work to bring equal pay to every woman in America, to every working person. They deserve it. Their families deserve it. Let us get the job done.

PAY EQUITY DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Pay Equity Day and to focus attention on the need for pay equity.

Mr. Speaker, women across this country are speaking out on the importance of Pay Equity Day as data has shown that women must work almost 7 working days to earn what men earn in only 5 days. Appropriately, I am introducing legislation that will require Federal agencies to undertake studies that examine pay inequities and identify institutional barriers that can be lifted in order to diminish this disparity.

Women make up more than half of this Nation's workforce. Yet, 38 years after passage of the Equal Pay Act, women still receive about 76 cents to

each dollar paid to men. That means that women have to work 15 extra weeks in 2001 to earn what men earned in the year 2000.

For women of color, the gap is even wider. Black women earn 65 percent and Hispanic women 52 percent of white men's weekly earnings. The wage gap widens as women mature and has significant implications for life-long savings, Social Security, and retirement earnings. Thus, lower pay is not the only source of difficulty. A higher percentage of women than men work in service, nonunion jobs, and part-time jobs, where pensions are less likely to be offered.

Additionally, while women no longer routinely drop out of the labor force for child-bearing and child-rearing, more women than men leave work to care for children, elderly parents, or spouses. All of these factors take their toll.

In the private sector, only 31 percent of retired women age 65 or older have a pension, and the median benefit received by women who have pensions is only 38 percent of the median amount received by men. Financial worries are exacerbated by the fact that women tend to live longer than men so their retirement assets must spread over a longer period of time. Clearly, there is something seriously wrong when women age 65 and older are twice as likely to live in poverty as their male counterparts.

Today, there are nearly 6 million women business owners. They are the fastest growing segment of small business development in this Nation. Between 1987 and 1999, the National Foundation for Women Business Owners estimated that the number of women-owned firms increased by 82 percent nationwide. However, women still have less access to credit and are less likely to receive financing than men. This is a severe barrier to business growth, Mr. Speaker, and ultimately prosperity. We must recognize that when women thrive, our Nation prospers and families are strengthened.

Women comprise more than half the world's population. We account for the majority of new workers in both industrialized and developing countries. When women are guaranteed basic human and labor rights, whole families and communities benefit. When women gain knowledge, power, and equal resources to make their own choices, the chains of poverty will be broken.

□ 1945

This is how progress is generated. This is how lasting prosperity is built and measured.

Mr. Speaker, I will end with the words of Supreme Court Justice Ruth Bader Ginsberg who said, "Bias, both conscious and unconscious, reflecting traditional and unexamined patterns of thought, keeps up barriers that must come down if equal opportunity and nondiscrimination are ever genuinely to become this Nation's law and practice."

Fighting for pay equity and advancing the status of women is not just a social and moral issue, Mr. Speaker, it is an economic imperative, and it is long overdue.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TIBERI). Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. NORTON addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. PRICE of North Carolina addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

DECONTAMINATION EFFORTS REQUIRE IMMEDIATE ACTION BY CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the subject of my Special Order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, it is time at this juncture appropriate to step back and take stock of recent actions. We have had some commentary here on the floor this evening dealing with the environment and dealing with the recent activities of this Congress and the administration. I think it is appropriate for us to do this, as I have fresh in my mind very vivid memories of a tour that I organized today to visit the exclusive residential area of Spring Valley here in the District of Columbia around the American University campus. It was a tour to be able to understand clearly one of the key environmental issues that deals with 1,000 sites around the country.

Twenty-six years after the Vietnam War, 56 years after the conclusion of World War II, 83 years after World War I, there is still a battle taking place, and it is taking place right here on the soil of America. It involves mines, nerve gases, toxics and explosive shells. This battle has claimed 69 lives and has maimed and injured far more. Sadly, this battle continues every day. If we are not careful in this country, it may continue for another 100 years, 500 years. There are some estimates that the areas of contamination by military

hazardous waste are such that at the current rate, it may take over 1,000 years.

Toxic explosive wastes of our military activities here in the United States, unexploded ordnance on formerly-used defense installations, probably contaminates at least 25 million acres in the United States, and, indeed, that number could be as much as twice as high, approaching 50 million acres or more. Sadly, nobody can even give an accurate appraisal of this problem, but we do know that at the current rate of spending, which is less than \$300 million a year, this problem of many billion dollars of magnitude will take centuries to return the land to safe and productive uses. Sadly, some areas of this country are so damaged that we cannot even attempt to clean them up at all.

Mr. Speaker, unexploded ordnance is a serious problem today. Human activity and wildlife is encroaching on more and more of these sites as our neighborhoods grow, as our cities sprawl, and, at the same time, the natural rhythm of nature, flooding, earthquakes, landslides, aided and abetted by human activity, exposes these dangers as the land mines, as the unexploded bombs and shells work their way to the surface. Today across America we are finding lost and forgotten unexploded ordnance that in some cases was intentionally buried in a feeble attempt just to get rid of it, or we find shells that were fired and missed their mark and did not explode as intended. These are acute dangers.

I recall one example that occurred in San Diego where two children, actually there were three, who were playing on a vacant lot in a subdivision that was formerly military territory. This had been used as a bombing ring, as a target. These children found an unexploded shell, started playing with it. It detonated. It killed two of them and seriously injured a third.

At the sites that I visited today, there is a child care center on the campus of American University that has been closed because the level of toxicity from arsenic is so high that it poses a threat to human health. Across the road there is a grand home that belongs to the Korean Ambassador, and the whole backyard has been excavated away, as they are dealing there again with high levels of soil contamination. There are acres and acres of this site next to the American University campus and some that is on the campus itself that was used to test chemical weapons during World War I. At the height of the activity, there were almost 2,000 people working on this area. There were over 100 buildings. They were testing things like mustard gas, arsenic. There were circles where they tied animals and subjected them to the gas. There were areas where they manufactured these chemical weapons.

When the war was over, we were pretty haphazard about what happened there. In some cases, the buildings

were so contaminated, they just burned them, and then covered them up. There was no careful accounting of the materials, and we have found over the years that some of the shells and explosives and toxics have been exposed.

There was some construction there of late, in the last decades, in the 1990s, and as they were bulldozing away, they found shells that contained toxic explosives. There was a glass container that was broken in the late 1990s during construction that sent workers to the hospital. There was phosphorus that was encountered that when the container was broken open and the phosphorus was exposed to the air, it exploded into flame. Now, this is an area that is developed with homes and a university campus less than a 30-minute bike ride from where I am speaking this evening. We were done with it by 1919, and yet we have yet to thoroughly decontaminate the area.

Now, there are many targets of frustration that citizens can have to direct their anger and concern. They can be frustrated and angry with the Department of Defense or the Corps of Engineers or the EPA or local authorities. People have legitimate concerns about these and other agencies about what they have done in the past and what they are doing now. But sadly, there is one participant in this battle that is missing in action: the United States Congress.

Only we in Congress can set adequate funding levels, can budget clearly, make sure enough money is appropriated to do the job right. Congress can pinpoint managerial responsibility and establish the rules of the game. It is not acceptable to me, and I hope not acceptable to the American public, for Congress to occasionally step in from the sidelines, complain, protest, perhaps shift already inadequate budget resources from one high-priority project to another. This is worse than a zero-sum game and does not advance the goal of protecting the public. Congress needs to report for duty and needs to provide the administrative and financial tools that are necessary.

Now, I am not talking about the active ranges and military readiness. There are issues there, but that is a separate topic for another time. My concern is for the closed, the transferred or the transferring properties where the public is exposed, soon will be exposed, or unsuspecting children and members of the public could potentially be exposed in the future. More than 1,000 years to clean up these sites is not an appropriate timetable when people are at risk, and they are, in fact, at risk every day.

Mr. Speaker, we need to provide the resources to solve this problem, not in 1,000 years or 300 years, but in the lifetime of our children. If we do this, provide the momentum, the energy, there will be improvement in technology, the development of appropriate partnerships that will mean we can make a quantum improvement in our ability to

find these hazards, the unexploded ordnance, to decontaminate the sites, to have the infrastructure companies train personnel to do it right.

I do believe that if we in this Chamber made a commitment that we would get the job done, say, in the next 75 years, it could create such a burst of enthusiasm and energy, that, in fact, we could get the job done far sooner.

Our goal in Congress should be to make sure that the administration and that every Member in the House and the Senate understands what is going on; what is going on in their State, what is going on from border to border, coast to coast, because this is a problem in every single State in the Union. Our goal is to make sure that there is somebody, one person, who is in charge. Our goal is to make sure that there is enough funding so that we can at least get the cleanup done this century, hopefully sooner, and that no child will be at risk for death, dismemberment, or serious illness as a result of the United States Government not cleaning up after itself.

I come here tonight with serious concern about the environment and with initially a plea for bipartisan cooperation in Congress, in the House and in the Senate, and with the administration to solve this problem. That is, in fact, what should be our approach to protecting our environment, to making our communities more livable and our families safe, healthy and more economically secure.

□ 2000

It should be in a bipartisan, objective, thoughtful approach.

Mr. Speaker, I will tell the Members that I have been deeply concerned by the events that have occurred with this new administration. There was in fact an opportunity to take the rhetoric of Governor Bush on the campaign trail, and the rhetoric that we heard from President Bush as he was installed in office, to reach out, to be a compassionate conservative, to work together to solve America's problems. That was what we heard on the campaign trail.

But, as some of us were concerned about on the floor of this Chamber, as we spoke out during the last campaign, it is important to look at a candidate's performance, not just the words.

Frankly, I was concerned that this administration that we have now with President Bush, because of its past record, would not measure up to the rhetoric, the soft and fuzzy language we were hearing on the campaign trail.

Sadly, my worst fears have in fact been confirmed. I will tell the Members candidly, even though I was a strong opponent of the President on the campaign trail, and I had no illusions based on his record as Governor of Texas that he was going to be particularly environmentally sensitive, frankly, I was shocked at what we have been visited with as a nation in the first hours of this administration.

We have heard them push ahead with proposals to solve our energy crisis,

not with the summoning of a call to arms to use our energy more thoughtfully, more carefully, more constructively to conserve. Instead, they are pushing ahead with their proposal to drill for oil in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge, even though this will take perhaps a decade, even though this is opposed by the majority of the American public, even though this will be a false proposal to provide energy security for the United States.

The Secretary of Energy managed to make an entire speech about the so-called energy crisis that we are in right now, and there was profound concern expressed in calling for building 1,600 new generation plants, and virtually no word about conservation. I believe there was one line about energy conservation.

There was no word about the opportunity to conserve oil by improving the mileage of American vehicles, even though this is the area in which it would be easiest for us to take aggressive action.

Indeed, this administration is proposing a budget that will cut the budget of the Department of Energy 7 percent and cut money for energy conservation 10 percent, an absolute wrong-headed approach for energy conservation.

This administration took action to reverse the cleanup regulation for hardrock mining, returning to regulations from 1980 that do not require mining companies to pay for their own cleanup and restoration when mining for silver, gold, and other metals. That is absolutely outrageous, and completely out of sync with where the American public is.

This administration is failing to regulate CO₂ emissions from power plants. This is despite explicit campaign promises from candidate Bush that he was going to introduce mandatory legislation to deal with a reduction of CO₂ emissions. This was a formal presentation of the most highly-scripted campaign perhaps in our Nation's history. They knew exactly what they were doing.

Indeed, President Bush as a candidate attacked, during the debate with Vice President Gore, attacked the Vice President, who has a lifetime of working to protect the environment, because he was too soft; because he, Gore, was not willing to embrace what candidate Bush was promising, but what President Bush turned his back on, changed his mind on, conveniently, after the election when he was facing a little pressure to follow through on his campaign promise.

They are taking action in this administration to delay implementation of the roadless areas protection policy until May, and most people feel that they are simply embracing delays and catering to the special interests that want to open these areas more to timber companies, to off-road vehicles, and that this is just the first step to repeal this important protection.

This administration, with its about-face on the campaign pledge for the CO₂ emissions, is not just breaking a pledge that was made to the American voters. This is having a destabilizing effect on our efforts to work with other national governments to follow through on the Kyoto accords, on the greenhouse emissions treaty. It is angering important allies, and dodging the United States' responsibility to reduce greenhouse gas emissions.

It seems to me disingenuous to point a finger at developing countries like China and India and say that they have to solve the problem when the United States, as the greatest polluter of greenhouse gases, emitting six times the world average per capita, twice as much as our allies in developed countries like Japan and Germany, when the United States fails to step forward and to provide leadership in this global concern.

The administration, the President, suggests that we need more time to study whether or not we have a problem with greenhouse gases and global warming, despite the overwhelming consensus of the environmental and scientific community since having 8 of the last 10 years be the highest temperatures on record; as we are seeing the ice caps shrink, as we see glaciers shrink.

The rest of the world knows that we have a problem, and that it is time for the United States to assume leadership.

In fact, President Bush could just simply listen to members of his own cabinet. The Secretary of the Treasury, Paul O'Neill, in his previous life as chairman and CEO of Alcoa Aluminum, likened global warming to a potential disaster on the par of a nuclear holocaust. This was 2 years ago that Secretary of the Treasury, in his prior life as a respected business leader, was saying, we need to get serious. Now President Bush and this administration are falling back from our global responsibility.

I had an eye-opening experience on the campus of American University on the hazards of arsenic. As I was looking at that site of the former military test ground for chemical weapons at American University in the Northwest part of the District of Columbia, I thought about this administration and wondered if we could get them excited about it, because this, after all, is the administration that has now recently revoked the arsenic rule, dismantling a rule that was mandated by Congress to reduce the level of carcinogenic arsenic in water from 50 parts per billion to 10 parts per billion and provide healthier drinking water for the American public.

This is not some crazy standard that is being proposed by the rabid environmentalists in the Clinton administration, this is the standard of the European Union, of the World Health Organization. This was the standard that was recommended for the American

public for its protection. Yet, this administration has now revoked that rule.

It is hard to imagine what would have happened if candidate Bush had spoken what was in his mind and his heart on the campaign trail. I think if he had proposed revoking the arsenic rule as a candidate, I do not think we would have had to worry about hanging chads in Florida. I do not think the election would have even been close, the election where Vice President Gore got the majority of votes of the American public.

This administration has proposed eliminating Project Impact, a creative project with the Federal Emergency Management Administration that is working with over 2,500 partners in the private sector around the country, and dozens and dozens of governments are working to eliminate hazards before they occur from flooding, hurricane, and earthquake.

This administration is ignoring the energy crisis in ways that could have the most impact now. If we ask any of the experts in the energy field, there is only one thing that is going to make a difference in the short term to provide more energy for those of us in the West who are having a serious problem, particularly in the Pacific Northwest. Because of the drought, we have been supplying energy that we cannot afford to share, actually, with our friends in California. We are paying far higher prices for the privilege. Yet, if we ask the experts in industry, in the environmental community, in business, in the neighborhoods and local government, the only thing that is going to make a difference now is energy conservation: making do with what we have in a more creative way.

There are simple things we can do. Painting the roofs in California a light color that is reflective could cut the energy requirement for air conditioning by 30 percent. But where are we hearing a call to arms from this administration for people to do something right now that is going to make a difference in cutting down on the waste of energy? We listen in vain. It is not on their radar screen.

We have seen this administration move forward threatening the designation of important national monuments. One of the areas that the last administration will be known for for generations in a positive way is moving to protect critical designations of national monuments, the most designations since the Antiquities Act was first used by President Teddy Roosevelt almost a century ago.

Now this administration has signaled its intention to revisit these national monument designations. They want to have more comment to see if there is more that could be done for vehicle use, grazing, extracting more water, and mining that could alter or threaten these national treasures.

We have seen the budget that has been submitted by this administration

that was going to be more compassionate, kinder, gentler. They are, in their rush to have a tax cut that was supposed to only be \$1.6 trillion, and now is over \$2 trillion and counting in terms of the proposal they want, they are, in order to be able to carve out money in the budget to do this, they are reducing funding for everything from child care assistance for low-income families, programs to combat child abuse, cutting funding for the Interior Department, the EPA, and important bipartisan conservation agreements.

As I mentioned, this budget proposes a 7 percent reduction in the budget of the Department of Energy when allegedly some people in this administration think we have an energy crisis, and a 10 percent reduction in energy conservation when this is the only approach that is going to make a difference this year.

I recently had lunch with the retiring superintendent of Yellowstone Park, Michael Finley, a creative, brilliant public servant who has served us, and served us well, for over 30 years.

Mr. Finley, and I think it is no coincidence that he is an Oregonian and has this reverence for the treasure that he was able to have stewardship for, he called forth the critical requirement to control the use of snowmobiles in our national parks, like Yellowstone.

□ 2015

Mr. Speaker, it is a tragedy and a travesty to have people roaring through at 60 miles an hour, 80 miles an hour, spewing forth pollution, the noise, the hazard to wildlife, the hazard to the air, the hazard to the tranquility that other park-goers treasure and, indeed, a risk to each other in terms of the death that results from the reckless operation.

This administration is now reviewing the important Yellowstone-Grand Teton rule and possibly settling lawsuits with snowmobile groups in order to reverse the rulemaking, an outrage for these national treasures. Again, candidate Bush gave no hint that he would be involved in such reckless antienvironmental activity.

Another area that is going to have significant environmental inconveniences has to do with the judicial process. One of the things that concerned a number of us when candidate Bush was running for office was his identification of people like Justice Scalia and Justice Thomas as his role models for judicial candidates that he was going to nominate for our highest courts.

Given the environmental record of those two justices, it did not give much comfort to people who care about protecting the environment, because increasingly given the gridlock in Congress, citizens have to resort to our courts for the enforcement of environmental laws; and sometimes if there is an administration that is recalcitrant and bent on doing things like we are talking about with this administra-

tion, sometimes recourse to the courts is the only avenue open to citizens to protect the environment.

Mr. Speaker, I found it extraordinarily disconcerting that this administration has chosen to reverse a policy implemented by President Eisenhower over 50 years ago to provide the American Bar Association as a nonpartisan impartial body that would review the qualifications of judicial nominees.

This has served us well, Republican, Democrat, conservative and liberal. Every President since Eisenhower has relied on this screening process to help ensure, regardless of the philosophy of the candidates in question, to ensure the highest quality in terms of their standards, their qualifications.

This administration has decided to not have that impartial professional review from the bar association. They have removed the ABA from this role of interviewing the peers of the nominees and other people in the legal community about their competence, their integrity, and their judicial temperament; and instead it is all going to be done in the White House with the aid and assistance of organizations that are by no stretch of the imagination impartial.

In fact, you have seen in the newspapers of this country the expressions of glee on the part of the most reactionary elements that they have been able to push the ABA, making it easier to be able to have the most extreme people nominated and make it easier to confirm.

Finally, I would reference the repeal of the ergonomic standards for repetitive stress. This was important in terms of the work that is done. And I am not concerned frankly by the majority of the American employers. The vast majority of the people that I represent in Oregon, in areas that I have worked around the country, I am confident that these rules would have been easy for the vast majority of the business community to comply with; but in fact, the majority of them probably did not even need these rules in the first place. That did not mean that those rules were not important.

I wonder if representatives of this administration had talked, as I had, to a woman who was a chicken-thigh deboner, a woman who worked 8 hours, 10 hours, 12 hours a day in a cold workplace dealing with semifrozen chicken carcasses that speed past her, the same repetitive motion time and time again, talking about what happened to her, to her hands, to the amazing stress and the mind-numbing activity. It was for a woman like that that we needed to have that ergonomic rule.

There was a gentleman within an hour's drive from where we are, on Capitol Hill this evening, who is a chicken catcher, who catches chickens at the factory farms hour after hour after hour in the sweltering heat gathering them up, the feathers, the dust for hours at a time and carrying them to be loaded to go off for slaughter.

This is back-breaking, mind-numbing work; and these people need the benefit of the ergonomics rule. It is estimated that the stress and strain of repetitive-stress injury costs the economy over \$50 billion a year, but it is the largest single workplace safety and health problem in the United States today.

It is not just cost. It is the toll on workers who do not have the benefit in many cases of enlightened employers, the protection of unions for whom this rule promulgated by OSHA would have made all the difference in the world.

This President signed in to law legislation to overturn these standards and is going to have a serious effect on the health and welfare of tens of thousands of American workers who need this help the most.

Mr. Speaker, this is a summary of some of the most depressing actions on the part of this administration in just the first 3 months. These are not the actions of candidate Governor George Bush. These are activities that in some cases violate explicit campaign promises, misleading the American public about its intentions. There are things that are going to have serious consequences for decades to come.

Mr. Speaker, I am hopeful that we will have an opportunity to review in greater detail these activities on the floor of this Chamber. I am hopeful that the American public is going to push back to hold this administration accountable for the specifics and the rhetoric that was embodied on the campaign trail.

It is important for us to take several of these items to be able to focus on them, to make sure that the American public is, in fact, heard.

I think there is no area that perhaps there is a greater difference between where the American public is and where this administration is pushing than drilling in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge. This is one of the premier approaches to this administration for solving the energy crisis that they are talking about.

Bear in mind, as I mentioned, this administration is not proposing an increase in conservation. In fact, they are proposing to cut conservation dollars. They are proposing to cut the budget for the Department of Energy. Yet they are proposing to solve the problem by drilling in the Arctic Wildlife Refuge.

This refuge is a more sensitive area than Prudoe Bay. It is a resting, nesting and breeding area for over 160 species of birds, including species that visit each of the lower 48 States.

It is known as America's Sarengetti because of the huge herds of caribou, 130,000 of them that calf and rear their young on the coastal plane. These are the herds that provide subsistence for native Alaskans in an area whose way of life would be destroyed by a disruption of the herd.

We could talk about the disruption of the habitat of significant polar bear denning habitat, but the time this

evening actually does not permit me to go into the detail that I would; but suffice it to say that this is an area of deep, deep concern for many in the environmental community, because 95 percent of Alaska North Slope is already available for oil and gas exploitation and leasing.

This Wildlife Refuge is only the remaining 5 percent and it is the most sensitive. It is an area first and foremost that makes no sense in terms of a timely reaction to the energy problems that we have now.

First of all, only about 1 percent of the State that is having the most difficulty, California, comes from petroleum-based sources. Of that 1 percent, the Arctic Wildlife Refuge is not going to help at all. It will take conservatively 10 years before this oil is going to flow and be available.

But reflect for a moment the total amount of oil that would be available, according to reasonable projections, is only about a 6-month supply for the American public. It is an amount, to put it in perspective, that we could save if we simply increase the miles per gallon of SUVs in this country 3 miles a gallon. Three miles a gallon, we would not have to drill at all.

Okay. Maybe that is a radical notion to take SUVs and have a 3-mile per gallon improvement. Forgive me, but let us suggest a less radical proposal, because the mileage fleet numbers for the United States this year are tied for a 20-year low. Just taking that 20-year low and improving it ½ mile per gallon across the board for the fleet, we would not have to drill in the Arctic.

But what about energy security some of my colleagues suggest? This is an area that will improve America's energy independence and security by being able to exploit our own resources. This is perhaps the most bizarre notion that we are going to take an aging pipeline, 800 miles long that already has problems, and we are going to rely for our energy security for protecting this 800-mile length of the pipeline.

Everybody that I have talked to acknowledges that this 800-mile aging pipeline is already subjected to any deranged person, to hostile powers, to accident. If this is what we are relying on, we are potentially in big trouble in the future, because this 800-mile pipeline is a sitting duck for a terrorist, a foreign threat, or simply a deranged person in this country. We have seen them act.

It is far more appropriate, I would suggest, rather than drilling in the Arctic Wildlife Refuge, for us to get serious about improving fuel efficiency, improving how we utilize energy in this country, if we were only to listen to the American public.

□ 2030

The vast majority of the American public says nothing, and something that I have found intriguing, even citizens of Alaska are conflicted on this

issue. A slight majority in the most recent poll I have seen oppose development: 46.7 percent to 45.7 percent.

Now, these are people for whom the permanent fund in Alaska State with no sales tax, no income tax, that runs on revenue from oil, and every man, woman and child who has resided in Alaska for more than a year gets a payment, I believe last year it was \$2,000, these people with a financial stake in drilling, a slight majority oppose drilling in the ANWR. But this is not the limit of where the administration has reversed its direction and moved in the wrong way relating to the environment.

Mr. Speaker, we look at hardrock mining. One of the things that I was pleased the last administration did was to deal with proposing the regulations under which the Bureau of Land Management dealt with hardrock mining. The Clinton administration, after 4 years of work listening to the public, listening to the experts, looking at the impact, issued new regulations. These 3809 hardrock mining regulations required that the companies that mine for silver, for gold, copper, lead and zinc, that they have to administer and pay for cleaning and restoration efforts on the land once the mine closes to reduce the risk of water pollution. Reversing these regulations will open legal loopholes for the mining industry and allow them to evade cleanup costs after they finish mining.

From Pennsylvania to Montana to my State of Oregon, we have seen the devastation from the mining industry, often on public lands owned by the public. The mining companies are able to extract these minerals for a pittance, and bear in mind that the Mining Act of 1872 is exactly as it appeared when it was signed into law by President Ulysses S. Grant. It is not adequate to protect the American public. The American public does not get adequate value for the minerals that are extracted under it, unless you think \$250 an acre, in some cases \$5 an acre, is adequate payment to the American public for the ability to exploit, extract, and then leave ravished land.

These standards have aggravated the mining industry. They have prompted numerous lawsuits, and now the Bush administration has requested the return to the inadequate, inferior regulations of 1980.

Mr. Speaker, I am frankly shocked that we have seen this reversal. I am disappointed at a time when I would hope that there would be some areas that would be exempt from this extreme activity. According to Taxpayers for Common Sense, a watchdog agency that has helped us a great deal to sort of focus a spotlight on this, a non-partisan group that is looking over our shoulders, the return to the old rule would allow mining practices to continue that will cost taxpayers more than \$1 billion to clean up.

I think it is another example where we cannot afford these type of rever-

sals of the hard, painstaking activity of the previous administration.

Mr. Speaker, I referenced earlier in my opening summary that the administration has turned its back on the arsenic rules. I mentioned that this was something that was heavy on my mind because I had visited polluted sites here in the District of Columbia where arsenic contamination is something that we are spending millions of dollars to try to eliminate, yet last week the Environmental Protection Agency, and it is not just EPA, it is the Environmental Protection Agency, the same agency that was caught flat-footed when President Bush reversed himself on his explicit campaign promise to reverse CO2 emissions, the EPA has announced its intention to withdraw a new drinking water regulation on arsenic that was approved by the Clinton administration.

Administrator Whitman announced that the EPA will propose to withdraw the pending standard that was issued on January 22 that would have reduced the acceptable level of arsenic in water from 50 parts per billion to 10 parts per billion.

Mr. Speaker, this is a reduction in a standard of a known carcinogen, and it is not some wild-eyed environmental proposal. And forgive me at times for being a wild-eyed environmentalist, which is something, given the alternative, is not that bad. This 10-parts-per-billion standard is already the standard in place to protect the people in the European Union. This is the World Health Organization standard that is already in place. At least 11 million Americans rely on drinking water with arsenic standards higher than the proposed standard, and one that I think should give pause to Americans across the country.

This 55-parts-per-billion standard was adopted in 1942 by the Public Health Service. This was before we had proven the causal connection between arsenic and cancer. The National Academy of Sciences found that the EPA's old standard was not protective of health and should be reduced as promptly as possible. We do not need to study this anymore. It should be reduced as promptly as possible.

The National Academy of Sciences found in its unanimous 1999 report, Arsenic in Drinking Water, that the prior standard that the Bush administration proposes that we go back to "does not," and I am quoting, "achieve EPA's goal for public health protection; and, therefore, requires downward revision as promptly as possible."

The Academy found that drinking water at the current standard that the Bush administration now wants to go back to could easily result in a fatal cancer risk of 1 in 100. That is a cancer risk 1,000 times higher than the EPA allows for food, and 100 times higher than the EPA has ever allowed for tap water contaminants. Why in the name of all that is holy does this administration plan to go back, to reverse that standard, to study it further?

Arsenic is found in the tap water of millions of American homes. Over 26 million American homes have levels averaging over 5 parts per billion. Scientists point out that not everybody is equally susceptible. It is the children and pregnant women who are especially susceptible. A wider margin of safety might be needed when conducting risk assessments, the National Academy found, because of variations of the sensitivity of these individuals. But the Bush administration has proposed that we go back to the standard that was good enough for 1942.

Mr. Speaker, I am deeply concerned that this Congress, in its rush to focus on a very narrow agenda from the administration where they do not want to talk about these inconvenient proposals, these inconvenient reminders of their campaign pledges, they want to narrow the discussion to their economic agenda, and actually I do not have any qualms about the American public turning a searchlight on that proposal, on the \$1.6 trillion tax cut that was conjured up by Presidential candidate Bush 2 years ago because it was just right. We did not need it. The economy was rolling along and, therefore, we needed to return the surplus. Now the same proposal is needed when the economy is going down because that is somehow magically going to stimulate the economy. But of course that was not going to stimulate the economy 2 years ago.

There is a certain discontinuity, I find, in terms of that argument, and I would wish that the American public would focus on it. I would wish that the American public would focus on the illusory \$5.6 trillion surplus that the administration is claiming, except if they use the same budget assumptions that the recent commission reporting on Social Security and Medicare reported on, that the budget surplus evaporates. They assume that we are going to spend at a lower rate than even the revolution of Mr. Gingrich when they were riding high, and we never achieved the 4 percent reduction. They are assuming that tax breaks that we know are going to be reinstituted somehow are magically going to go away. And the fact that millions of Americans are going to be subjected to the alternative minimum tax, and we know that we are going to fix that at a cost of probably \$400 billion, all of these are ignored.

Mr. Speaker, I am happy to debate these on the floor of the Chamber. It would be nice to have debate time rather than rushing it through. At least our colleagues in the Senate are going to take some time and deliberate on it. I think it is ironic that this tax cut my colleagues think is so important, they have permitted 1 hour debate. At a time when we were standing around waiting for my colleagues to come back from meetings across the country, we could have had an opportunity to discuss it, if not amend it.

While we have that debate, it is important that every American reflect on

what is going on in the back rooms here in Washington, D.C., what is going on in the agencies as we are having campaign pledges reversed, as we are having campaign promises ignored, and we are having vital protections for the American public put at risk.

I came to Congress committed to work in a bipartisan, cooperative way for the Federal Government to be a better partner working with communities to make them more livable, to make our families safe, healthy and more economically secure.

Mr. Speaker, I fear that reversing the arsenic standard, drilling in the Arctic Wildlife Refuge, ignoring energy conservation, and turning our back on our leadership in global climate change is not in keeping with that goal.

Mr. Speaker, I am hopeful that there will be time for Congress to give voice to what the American public is concerned about in protecting the environment, and urge the Bush administration to reconsider these ill-advised policies. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to discuss these issues this evening.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the gentleman from Oregon, Mr. BLUMENAUER, for his leadership in the fight to build livable communities in a livable world.

I rise tonight to speak out against the pollution of our waters, our atmosphere, our wilderness, and our children.

Arsenic causes cancer. Global temperatures are climbing every year.

These are not wild theories, they are established science.

Nonetheless, the Bush Administration is turning back the clock to 1942 on arsenic regulations, is seeking to plunder the Arctic Wildlife Refuge, and is declaring that the Kyoto Protocol on Global Climate Change is dead on arrival.

As a candidate, George W. Bush declared, "We will require all power plants to meet clean air standards in order to reduce emissions of sulfur dioxide, nitrogen oxide, mercury and carbon dioxide within a reasonable period of time."

He also states that voluntary reductions were insufficient: "in Texas, we've done better with mandatory reductions, and I believe the nation can do better."

I agree. We can do better.

However, as President, Mr. Bush has reversed himself on carbon dioxide, claiming that the nation cannot afford to reduce emissions.

The fact is, we can't afford not to.

We cannot erase decades of progress.

We cannot wipe out the accomplishments of such wild eyed radicals as Richard Nixon who signed the Endangered Species and Clean Air Acts.

We have to move forward, not backward.

We have to set drinking water standards that will safeguard human health.

We need to establish protections for the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge and other irreplaceable wilderness areas.

And we need to live up to our commitments to reduce greenhouse gas emissions because global warming threatens the well-being of the entire planet.

Tomorrow, as a first step in restoring our national and international commitments to a

cleaner environment, I will be introducing the Carbon Dioxide Emissions and Global Climate Change Act.

This resolution will send a strong message to the President and the country that Congress will hold Mr. Bush to his campaign promises, that it recognizes that global warming poses grave dangers to our environment, our economy, and our national security, and that this country must seek to reduce its CO₂ emissions.

As a member of the International Relations Committee, I am fully aware of the impact that abandoning our commitment to reduce greenhouse gas emissions will have on our allies in Europe and throughout the world.

As a member of the human race, I am aware of the impact that it will have on our planet.

We must uphold our commitments and responsibilities to the rest of the world.

We are the biggest contributor to global warming, and we must also take the lead in reducing pollution.

Clean air and clean water are the most basic of human rights.

However, we have a President who apparently feels that arsenic is good for kids, that oil spills are good for caribou, and that excessive carbon dioxide is good for all of us.

The American people disagree.

They overwhelmingly oppose weakening arsenic standards, drilling in the Arctic Wildlife Refuge, and abandoning CO₂ reductions.

We cannot turn back the clock, we cannot abandon our commitments, and we cannot give up this fight for our future.

□ 2045

ELIMINATING THE ESTATE TAX

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CANTOR). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, the gentleman from South Dakota (Mr. THUNE) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. Speaker, when I came to Congress a little over 4 years ago, I came here with some very specific objectives in mind as well. And since coming to Congress, we have achieved a lot of the things that I sought to do in working with the House and our brethren in the Senate and the administration. For the 4th year in row we have balanced the Federal budget. We are actually paying down the publicly held debt. We have done that. This year it will be over \$600 billion.

We have protected Social Security and Medicare. We cut taxes back in 1997, something that had not happened in a very long time. In fact, the truth is the budget being balanced for the first time 4 years ago was the first time since 1969 when I was 8 years old. All my formative years all I heard about was deficits, deficits, deficits. And so finally we have gotten the fiscal house in order here in the United States Congress.

It is sort of ironic that our colleagues on the other side under whose stewardship the debt ballooned and spending ballooned now have this new-found sense of fiscal responsibility which in

the previous 40 years as these things were going on, they did not seem to abide that same compulsion toward constraint.

As a result, we spent and spent and spent to the point to where our children's future was very much in jeopardy and we piled up more and more debt. We are in a position now, Mr. Speaker, where we actually have gotten to the point that the Federal Government is taking in more money than it takes to run the cost of government. That means that the people in this country are overtaxed.

I would like to read for my colleagues something that a newspaper in my home State of South Dakota wrote recently. It says,

For the first time in recent memory, someone in Washington is looking the American people in the eye and stating the obvious. The Federal Government taxes too much and spends too much. It is refreshing to hear someone in Washington, D.C. state candidly that reducing the growth of spending is not a cut and that the source of deficits is unrestrained growth in spending. For Bush's budget plan to work as advertised, Members of Congress, the people who actually write the spending bills, have to listen to Bush's message. We hope they heard what the rest of us heard: "You're taxing us too much and spending too much of our money."

That is from the *Rapid City Journal* dated February 28, 2001.

Tomorrow, Mr. Speaker, we take up yet another piece of the tax plan that will allow the American people to keep more of their hard-earned dollars. We have for several weeks now been working in a systematic way here in the House to lessen the tax burden on working families in this country, to put some fairness and equity back into the Tax Code as it pertains to married couples who are penalized in the form of higher taxes because they chose to get married.

We are trying to bring some much needed tax relief to people who are raising families by increasing the per child tax credit and a number of other things, marginal rate reductions which affects everybody contrary to what our colleagues and our opponents of this legislation are suggesting, actually benefits everybody who pays income taxes in this country by lowering of rates.

The other thing is, Mr. Speaker, it actually brings tax reform to the Tax Code. Not only are we talking about tax relief, but about making the Tax Code more fair and reforming it in a way that makes it more equitable for the American people who pay all the taxes.

Tomorrow we pick up another piece. We start a debate, a debate which is long overdue, a debate which we have held here before this in this body. And on previous occasions have actually passed legislation that would eliminate the death tax, but unfortunately it ran into a veto pen at the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue.

Tomorrow we will take that legislation up again, very important legisla-

tion, and what I would like to visit about here in just a moment, and that is the death tax. It impacts farmers and ranchers and small businesspeople, the people who are the heart and soul of South Dakota's economy and I dare say of economies all over this country, particularly in rural areas of America.

We have some gentlemen on the floor this evening who are going to join in this discussion, one of whom is a Member of the Committee on Ways and Means and who had the privilege last week, I believe, of actually reporting out of that committee the legislation that we will be acting on tomorrow. I think it is important to note as we get into this debate again that this is a tax which is fundamentally unfair because after the Federal Government taxes and taxes and taxes people throughout the course of their lifetime on their earnings, on their work, on their accumulation of wealth and everything else, when it comes time to actually pass on to the next generation some of that hard work, the Federal Government comes in again and says, "I'm sorry, you can't do that. We want our fair share." It just so happens the Federal Government and their fair share takes in some cases about 55 percent of that estate. Now, that hits farmers and ranchers and small businesspeople right between the eyes because in many cases if you do not have the cash flow that is necessary to pay the tax, you have to liquidate the very assets that are producing in this country, adding to our economic growth and creating jobs.

Mr. Speaker, this evening I would first like to yield to the gentleman from Arizona, a distinguished member of the Committee on Ways and Means who was instrumental and had a hand in writing that legislation that we will be acting upon tomorrow.

Mr. HAYWORTH. I thank my colleague from South Dakota for taking this time, Mr. Speaker. We are joined by our colleague from Pennsylvania. Again we give thanks for the opportunity to come to this Chamber as a free people, holding opinions and living out notions that may be diametrically opposed.

Mr. Speaker, I could not help but notice the vision of America proffered by my friend from Oregon in the preceding hour. It seems we have a fundamental difference of opinion. He believes the highest and best use of a citizen's money is by the Washington bureaucracy. There is an element of thought here that everyday Americans should surrender more and more and more of their hard-earned money to the Federal Government through taxation because Washington can somehow do a better job with that money. Mr. Speaker, I would simply say to those who join us tonight, I think we have come to understand certainly in the last half of the preceding century that that notion is exactly backwards.

Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that for years my friends on the other side have

offered that outmoded notion that your family should sacrifice more so that Washington can do more, when instead we embrace the fundamental notion that Washington should make some sacrifices and be a good steward of the people's money so that families across America can have more. That is the crux of what we are discussing tonight.

Indeed, when you look throughout our history, and I am so glad we are joined by a friend from the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. Seeing him here on the floor, I am reminded of another great Pennsylvanian who one biographer calls really the First American, Dr. Benjamin Franklin, a noted scientist, statesman and a humorist. As a publisher in Poor Richard's Almanac, it was Dr. Franklin who observed there were only two certainties in life, death and taxes. But even with his prescience, even with his foresight, I doubt very seriously, Mr. Speaker, that Dr. Franklin could envision the day that the constitutional republic which he helped to found would literally tax Americans on the day of their death. Yet that is the spectacle we see today.

My colleague from South Dakota stated the problem accurately. For so many family-held businesses, for so many family farms and ranches, for indeed, Mr. Speaker, virtually the bulk of American commerce in rural areas, this death tax is especially egregious.

And we stand united tonight, Mr. Speaker, to reassure the American people that we offer a variation, a departure that rings out with echoes of the past. Our new slogan might be, "No taxation without respiration." It is fundamentally unfair to ask an American family to visit the undertaker and the tax collector on the same day. We have seen time after time small businesses, Mr. Speaker, what I would instead suggest are more accurately described as essential business because we know they employ more Americans than the major corporations in our society, but we see small businesses, essential businesses, family-owned enterprises snatched away by the hand of government and this excessive tax. We see ranches and farms, the proverbial land rich but cash poor circumstance because so many of those who literally make their livings off the land, pump their energy and their hearts and their very being not to mention what liquidity, what cash they have, back into the land, back into the farm, back into the ranch and when the holder of the estate dies, to liquidate, to come up with the cash to pay an extensive and expensive tax bill, the farm or the ranch is sold or divided up, subdivided, what some might suggest is the plague of urban sprawl.

So we come to this Chamber with a respectfully different approach than those on the other side who believe the highest and best use of your money is by Washington bureaucrats. We believe every American family should hang on to more of their hard-earned money and send less of it here to Washington.

That is why our colleague from South Dakota outlined the fact that just last week, we decided to say good-bye to the marriage penalty. We decided to raise the per child tax credit an extra \$100 this year to \$600 retroactive, eventually up to double what it was, to a full \$1,000.

We went back earlier as my colleague outlined and reduced the tax rates, the margins for every American paying income tax because we realized to reduce the tax bill, that is an important step. And now we come to this juncture, where last week the Committee on Ways and Means on the same day when on this floor we voted to get rid of the marriage penalty, we voted to increase the per child tax credit, we voted for common sense, family-friendly policies. We went back last week into committee and passed out of committee and will bring to the floor here tomorrow another common sense piece of legislation to put the death tax to death, because it is fundamentally unfair.

It is a job killer. It is a business killer. It drives a stake through the heart of family-owned enterprises. And it is patently wrong. How wrong? Simply stated, for all the headaches, for all the hassles, for all the heartaches, for all the turmoil, when you take a look at the vast expanse of Federal revenues, Mr. Speaker, the death tax brings into our Treasury about 1 percent of the total take from American citizens in terms of taxation. Yet three-quarters of that 1 percent is spent in hot pursuit of those families who are grieving, of those families who are trying to deal with the estates, of those families who are trying to come to grips with a fundamental change in circumstance, and that leads to the unfairness.

Mr. Speaker, for these reasons and several others, the death tax deserves to be put to death. We will take a very important step here tomorrow in that action.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. Speaker, I recognize my colleague from Pennsylvania, someone who came to this Chamber at the same time I did and a distinguished member of the Committee on Appropriations and someone who also has been a leader on this issue and someone who I believe probably has a good number of people in his fine State just like in my fine State who are impacted day in and day out, the people who are creating the jobs and helping create economic activity in this country and who are feeling the penalty of this very punitive tax.

And it is costing not only in terms of the tax itself and the people that it affects directly but the people day in and day out who take steps and spend dollars and spend time trying to figure out ways to avoid the tax, planning for the estate. It has become a cottage industry.

Frankly, it is hard to factor in and to quantify in specific terms all of the dollars that are affected here, all the dollars that are taken, soaked out of

the economy, not just by the death tax and the loss of jobs it has created when a small business or a family farm has to sell assets in order to pay that tax but also in the cost of avoiding the tax. That, too, I think robs our economy in a big way of much of the productivity that it could otherwise generate.

I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania for his observations as well about this important legislation and what we can do to further improve the plight of small businesses and farmers and ranchers in this country, many of which I know live in his district.

Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania. I am pleased to follow the gentleman from Arizona and my friend from South Dakota. I bring a background of being a small businessman myself. I owned and operated a supermarket for 26 years. I built it from scratch. I right now find that those who say this is about taxes for the rich do not have any idea what they are talking about. Because real rich people do not pay this tax. They use the complications of the tax system and the way they shield their resources, they are not the ones that pay it. Let me tell you who does. In the next 2 weeks, most of our small businesses that employ the vast majority of Americans are paying their income tax. They pay a lot of that, too, because they are the ones that pay the high rate. If you have a local business that has 100 employees and makes a decent profit, they are paying a lot of taxes and they are creating a lot of growth and wealth for our communities.

□ 2100

If you are building a community, what kind of a business do you want? Would you choose some global corporation that would put 500 jobs in your community or would you take five local companies that would put 100 jobs in your community where the families live there and work in the communities and serve on local governments and serve on boards and agencies and do all of those things that make communities good places to live?

I think we would all choose those five employers that have 100 people, because they are not going to be moving to Mexico; they are not going to move the plant to another State because this is their community.

If you want to talk about growing your community, I have come from a part of Pennsylvania that has been hit hard with companies closing. We have been hit hard for a lot of things that are no fault of the workforce and no fault of our area.

When you lose the local ownership of a company, the large global corporations may take a look at one of the businesses that have been in your community for years and has grown to 400 or 500 jobs and has a good workforce and a good product line, and let a death in the family come and that is the chance to buy that business and make it part of their global corporation.

Now, I am not against global corporations but when you lose that local ownership to the global corporation, it is never the same, because 5 years from now that business could be on a little bit of a hard time and it is very easy to take those machines and move them down the road or another country, and those jobs are gone.

The backbone of our communities is independent business, and this tax hits them really hard. This is the tax that forces them to make that decision, because they cannot borrow that much money and still make the business profitable, and the only economic choice they have is to sell it.

I think that is the part that people must realize. This is the backbone of our communities, independent businesses that are growing and prospering. They pay that tax on January the 15th, this year, next year, the year after. They build this nest egg. They do not have huge Keoghs and huge IRAs. They have their resources in the business, in the building, in the inventory, in the machines. That is their family nest egg, and maybe the funds have helped grow the business and they have worked like troopers to grow this business and create more jobs in the community; and the father or the parent dies and the business has to be sold because there is not enough equity left after you pay the estate taxes.

Whether it is farmers, whether it is a local supermarket, whether it is a local manufacturer, a local processor, whatever, it is local employers that make our communities good places in which to live, and the estate tax is the greatest threat to local jobs of any part of our tax package. That accumulation of wealth by buying more machines and adding on to the building and all of that, that is out of profits that they have paid their taxes on. This is not through some cheating or somehow taking money out of the business. This is taking the profits, paying their taxes, taking what is left and putting it back into the business and hiring 5 more people. That is what America is all about. That is where we are better than most any part of the world. The free market system allowed someone like me, when I started my business, to borrow against my father's home. Now, today banks will not do that.

I knew one thing, though. I knew that I could not fail, I could not jeopardize my mother's and father's home. I had to pay that loan back, but that is how I got started in business because I didn't have any cash of my own. My father mortgaged his home and some land he owned so I could go into a little small, corner grocery store and I grew it into a supermarket that served the community for more than 2 decades.

That is the future of America, the ability of individuals with a new idea, a new concept, to grow business, and the estate tax or the death tax is one of the greatest threats for that business staying in your community, staying in the next generation.

There are very few businesses, because of the estate tax, that last to the third generation, a small fraction. There is a myth, a Federal estate tax is an efficient way to distribute wealth. Well, the reality is, and the gentleman said it very similarly, the Joint Economic Committee found that the cost of collection and compliance, and that includes the litigation and disputes between the IRS and taxpayers, makes it a wash. So the government really does not benefit from all the money they spend collecting the estate taxes. It is a wash. But at the same time those 500 jobs, those 300 jobs, those 50 jobs, those 40 jobs from our communities are gone forever.

It is the second and third tax on the same income, and it just should not be.

Mr. THUNE. If the gentleman would yield back, I could not agree more. I think, unfortunately, the gentleman hit it exactly on the head. If you are talking about a small town environment, a rural area like the one I come from, oftentimes it is. I mean, the only economic activity, the only hope for jobs and that sort of thing in some of those small communities, really is those small independent businesses. If those people cannot stay in business because the Federal Government insists on taxing them, as you said, over and over and over again and then when it comes time to expire they get taxed again, there is only so much that those small businesses can abide and still continue to do what they do, and that is provide the jobs and provide not only the jobs but the benefits to their employees.

What the gentleman is talking about here again is the cost of compliance with the estate tax and everything else. It robs dollars that otherwise could be put into things like providing health care for their employers.

Now we have a gentleman with us here this evening, and I would note that there is a famous gentleman from Illinois, from his home State, who once said, and I quote Abraham Lincoln, "It is not the years in your life that count. It is the life in your years."

Unfortunately, there are thousands of hard working business owners and family farmers who have a difficult time enjoying the life in the years with the shadow of the estate tax looming over them.

The gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SHIMKUS) is with us this evening on the floor. He is someone who as a member of the Committee on Commerce and someone who as well also has a number of small businesses and people in his district who are affected by the death tax, and someone who I might add whose in-laws live in South Dakota so he has an extra special reason to be interested in this because my constituents care very deeply about this. I would be happy to yield to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SHIMKUS).

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, I came over on this side because I know tomorrow we will have a lot of our

friends on the Democrat side of the aisle who are going to come and join us in support. I am speaking on behalf of my constituents and also for all my friends on this side who again I know will join us.

I will try to be brief. I cannot match the eloquence of the folks down here.

Yesterday, some interest groups took opposition with my support of the death tax. One of the comments was made, well, only one in 20 farms actually have to be sold. And my point to them was, well, obviously it is not your farm. If there is one in 20 farms, which we know is not a good measure, it is definitely not their farm that has to get sold, and we can give countless cases in the 20th District of Illinois of farms being sold.

I have one in Christian County that was just devastating, but I would like to talk especially about the agricultural economy as was addressed by my colleague from Pennsylvania, the compliance costs, because we know that we are in one of the lowest periods of commodity prices since the Depression.

Part of farm income, income on the balance and income statement, you have revenue and you have expenses. Well, people fail to understand the compliance cost to save the farm from the death tax is an added cost of doing business, which in these low commodity prices makes it very, very difficult to make ends meet. So in eliminating the death penalty, what you do is you are going to help the farm income of the family farm in the 20th District and throughout the country.

The second thing I want to mention, I have two cases both in Quincy, Illinois. One was back in 1969, Rich Neimann, who when his father passed away, and he is the chairman and CEO of Neimann Foods, Incorporated, of Quincy, Illinois, when Richard's father passed away suddenly in 1969 the family was faced with an estate tax bill of several hundred thousand dollars which was due, by law, within 9 months. The Neimann family had to use all the resources from the sale of the company's wholesale operations to pay the estate tax bill. In essence, they sold the wholesale operation of their business to provide funds to pay the death tax. That was in 1969.

More recently, 17 months ago, a good friend of mine, a small business owner from Quincy, Illinois, Mike Nobis, his brothers and sisters lost their parents 17 months ago when there was a travel accident involving their motor home, and both the mother and his father passed away.

The parents left behind a family printing business and estate tax bill of more than \$370,000. To prevent this tax burden from destroying the family business, listen to what they did, the company put off buying capital expenses, which you would expect. They also got the 45 employees to agree, so they could keep their jobs, to double as much as they pay in health insurance. The employees agreed to double the

amount that they paid in health insurance to keep the business in operation.

This is not just a burden on the small business. This is a burden on the working men and women who are employed by these small businesses. I just think it is a compelling story that in small town USA that these employees would go to bat for the employer and suck it up to keep the business in operation.

Two last points I want to make to the super wealthy who think this is unnecessary, there is a simple solution; and I challenge them. All they have to do is gift it to the Federal Government, just get out their checkbook. We will take it. We will put it in the Treasury. We will use it to pay down debt. If they want to turn over that money, I think we would welcome it.

The last point I want to talk about is just ideology. I think ideology is so important, and as a former government teacher sometimes we get lost in the view of government. The death tax really speaks to the debate on ideology, conservative versus liberal. It really addresses a point of who controls after-taxed wealth in America. And that is what, for me, this debate is all about. It is very simple. Who controls after-taxed wealth that has already been created after it has already been taxed?

My friends, the liberals, would say, well, government ought to control it because government has plans to redistribute that wealth throughout the country.

We would say that is an award and a benefit for taking the capital risk and creating jobs and keeping our economy going and if you want other people to go back to small town America to create five to 10 to 15 jobs, you ought to make sure that they can pass on their after-taxed wealth, after-taxed wealth, to their family.

So I appreciate the gentleman scheduling this hour to talk about this. It is very timely with our vote tomorrow. I know I have a lot of friends on this side that are going to be very supportive. I look forward to the debate and I look forward to casting the votes. It is a pleasure to join my colleagues down on the floor.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. Speaker, I would simply say in echoing the remarks of the gentleman that if we think about the way that this impacts people, okay, yes, obviously they are going to talk about and we are going to hear a lot of rhetoric on the floor tomorrow and a lot of propaganda and demagoguery about how this is going to help the really mega rich in this country, but the reality is it affects people, average people, who are investing, who are taking that risk, who are using the market system that we have in this country, to create a better life for themselves and their families, but also to create jobs and a better quality of life for the people who are working for them and to build their communities.

There is not a small businessperson in a small town who is not the one who

gets asked to support every single charity, every single activity that is going on, whether it is the local baseball team or whatever, and they are there to step up and to support those many activities, and it is part of our community life.

I am going to give an example. I want to read a short letter here that I received from a constituent in South Dakota. This is a family farmer and this is again a direct impact not on the super rich but on the family farmer, "Eleven years after my mother died and 7 years after my father passed away, I still cannot be sure that the estate is settled. We sold off 480 acres of the family farm to pay the taxes, but I do not have a final signed letter from the IRS stating that the estate and the audit are officially closed. My wife and I have to meet with an estate planning team on a regular basis to try to keep our children from experiencing the same estate tax problems we have had."

Those are the words of a South Dakota farmer who has been hit hard by this death tax. Surprisingly enough, he considers himself one of the lucky ones. He actually survived the death tax and he can still farm after selling a quarter of his land, land that has been in his family for generations.

□ 2115

His family farm narrowly survived, even though he was hit 3 times. Not only did he and his family pay the Federal estate tax, he paid nearly \$71,000 in State inheritance taxes and he had to shell out at least \$30,000 in legal fees to settle the estate. Now, his children, of course, stand to face the same problem if we do not do something about repealing this tax.

Unfortunately, this farmer's story is all too common in rural America. The death tax literally can destroy family-owned farms and ranches by forcing farmers and ranchers to sell off land, buildings and equipment just so that they can pay Uncle Sam.

Make no mistake about it. Despite the rhetoric we are going to hear here tomorrow, when farms and ranches disappear, the rural economy suffers. We are seeing people move out of rural areas into more populated areas of this country. If we want to preserve the fabric and the bedrock values of this country and make it strong by allowing family farming to survive, we have to do something about this death tax.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. HAYWORTH).

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from South Dakota, and I would say to the gentleman from Illinois, he sells himself short, Mr. Speaker, when he supposed a lack of eloquence on his part, because nothing is more eloquent than the real-life experiences of fellow citizens that he outlined for us. The gentleman from South Dakota has followed suit. Then, of course, we have the gentleman from Pennsylvania here who built a busi-

ness, a grocery store in his hometown, employing local folks. Talking about the local perspective is so vital.

Mr. Speaker, I would note that the gentleman in the chair, the Speaker pro tempore, from the first district of Arizona, we can claim a unique vantage point because the Speaker pro tempore hails really from the 6th congressional district, the town of Snowflake, named for the founding families, the Snow family and the eponymously named Flake family. Yes, Mr. Speaker, we understand how this affects rural and small town America. But as we have seen in Arizona, with the incredible growth and, indeed, over the last 10 years, the equivalent of the State of Nebraska has moved to Arizona; we have growing urban areas, we have people coming in from all over the United States.

One lady stopped me in one of our cities the other day and she talked of the experience of her father who was a milkman in post-World War II America. He got up every day very early, ran his route, saved what he could, invested wisely, and built what some would call a nest egg, but what the Federal Government calls a substantial estate in the millions of dollars. The lady who stopped me, Mr. Speaker, said, you would never have thought that. My father was a hard-working man, but even he said about his profession that he was blessed to live in America and to have those opportunities, but in much the same way our colleague from Illinois outlined the problems, in much the same way our colleague from South Dakota read of the plight of a farmer in his home State, so this was this suburban housewife, the beneficiary, if you will, of her father's estate, having to grapple with this incredible problem. She and her siblings were bearing the brunt of liquidating their father's estate. His hard work, the wages on which he had been taxed, his very success was being penalized.

My colleague from Illinois had it right when he talked about a grand debate, a fundamental difference of vision. When it comes to the notion of wealth, there are those in this chamber who honestly believe, as difficult as it is for most Americans to grasp this, they honestly believe that the Federal Government, that the Washington bureaucracy should have first dibbs on your money, and that death is a watershed event, and that the family should pay up, oftentimes in excess of 50 percent.

My friend from Illinois brought up another topic that bears amplification because, Mr. Speaker. In this town, there is the punditocracy. There are special interest groups who step forward with the most curious ideas, and the irony we have seen of the mega rich stepping forward to say that this death tax should be enforced deserves some comment. The gentleman from Illinois, Mr. Speaker, was exactly right. If our friends who are mega rich, billionaires and in some slang

gazillionaires, if they believe that their progeny would receive the fruit of their labors as some ill-gotten gains, if they honestly believe that sending their wealth to the Federal Government is the highest and best use of their funds, then by all means, Mr. Speaker, they should find their attorneys, they should prepare their estates or perhaps have the check ready right now to hand over the bulk and entirety of their estates to the Federal Government. But for the milkman who passed away, whose daughter, the proverbial soccer mom is having to deal with this real problem, to the family rancher in the 6th district of Arizona, to the small business owner in the town of Snowflake, I respectfully say, let us restore some fairness. Is it fair to expect those people who survive to liquidate assets and send over 50 percent to the Federal Government? No, that is wrong.

Mr. Speaker, the fact is, tomorrow we will take steps to address this fundamental issue of fairness when we take the steps to eventually put this death tax to death.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. Speaker, I would just say that many opponents of the Federal estate tax, including me, I criticized it as being a death tax; it is a death tax, there is no question about it, and I believe it is fundamentally unfair, as the gentleman just noted, to tax death. But again, characterizing the death tax as only taking effect when someone dies does not paint the full picture of this thing, and it is a misguided policy. Because the estate tax does not just rear its ugly head when someone dies; as Abraham Lincoln said, it is not just the years of your life that count, it is the life of your years. It is present through the life of our years, and this fact can be plainly demonstrated by looking at the arguments being made by those who are opposed to its repeal, because they talk a lot about targeting tax relief by increasing the small business and family farm exemption already found in the Tax Code. This is, again, of how the IRS, how much paperwork it takes to maintain this Tax Code, the exemption consumes nearly 13 pages in the Tax Code. Now, ironically, it is so narrow and so complex that it only applies to roughly 3 percent of small businesses and family farms. So in order to qualify for that exemption, taxpayers have to start planning while they are alive in order to meet the rigorous adjusted gross estate value and material participation requirements that are in that Tax Code. We talk about it as a death tax, and it is that, but it is also a tax during people's lives that they have to plan for over and over, again and again, depriving the resources, the time, the investment that could be put to much more productive use.

Incidentally, I just want to mention too, because I think the gentleman from Pennsylvania noted earlier how often it is that actually a family farm or small business or operation gets passed on to the next generation, and

the numbers I have here in front of me say that 80 percent of small employers spend the costly resources to protect their families from the death tax and in spite of that, in spite of that, they still often fail, because 70 percent of small and family-owned businesses do not survive through the second generation, and 87 percent do not make it to the third generation. So 9 out of every 10 successors whose family business failed within 3 years of the owner's death said death taxes played a major role in that company's demise.

So if we think about the impact this has on the transfer of the economic engine in this economy for the next generation and what we are doing, which is, in effect, making it even more difficult than it is, and it is difficult enough to make that happen. So again, this is a tax on death, it is a tax on life; it is something that is so costly to comply with and something which literally deprives one generation of Americans who have worked very, very hard for the benefit of passing that hard work on to the next generation.

So I just think again, we have an opportunity to do something about this and we have tried and tried and tried, as the gentleman from Arizona always says, to get this done, and yet despite our best efforts in the last couple of years, because again we met the veto pen at the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue; this year it is different. There is a new sheriff in town and we have an opportunity to do what is right by family farmers and ranchers and small business people, not just in the rural areas of the country, but in the more populated areas, like the gentleman from Arizona where he lives.

I might add that a lot of people from my State like to go down there because it is a little warmer climate than what we have had to deal with, but there are a lot of us who like to live in South Dakota in spite of the climate because of the quality of life, and part of the quality of life hinges upon having an active economy and making sure that the government is not making more out of that economy than is necessary and allowing it to continue to grow and provide jobs. So there are a lot of young people who want to live in South Dakota when they grow up to have that opportunity.

Mr. Speaker, this is important work that we are doing. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania who again spoke so eloquently earlier about his personal experience with this issue.

Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, if you want less of something, tax it another way, another time; if you want more of something, do not tax it. Any time we can remove an impediment from businesses succeeding, we ought to be about it.

I am going to diverse just for a moment, because Bill Gates has said this 3 or 4 times in my presence and it has made a big impact on me. He said, as he travels around the world, because he is one of the leaders of the technology

revolution that has brought about the strong economy in this country, he says, everywhere he goes, he will go to Japan and he said, why did it not happen here first? Why did it happen in the States? He will go to Germany and Europe and other countries, and he will say, why did it not happen here? We are smart people. And he said the reason it did not happen there and that it happened here is we have the most economic freedom. We have the least bureaucracy. We have the least power in the bureaucracy to control and regulate.

Now, a lot of us think we have too much, but we do not have as much as they do. He said, they could not have brought about the changes that were necessary to implement this. This technology was around a while before it took off, before it became this spur to our economy. I just want to say that, because it is that economic freedom of this country that we must defend.

The difference in America from anywhere else in the world, and our future, in my opinion, depends on the ability of any individual that has a process, a manufacturing process or a commodity to market that process or that commodity or manufacture that product and compete against the big boys. Now, when I was in the food business, I was an independent supermarket. I had to fight the chains. Now, I do not dislike the chains. They are large, they are powerful, they have hundreds of stores and the power of buying, and I had to compete with them. But that is what America is about, allowing little people with big ideas and lots of intense hard work to build a business. We never know when we have an employer of 50 people that can suddenly bust out and be 500 people, 5,000 people. I have seen it happen, where somebody started in a garage and then moved into a vacant building and the next thing we know, they are building new factories and they are employing hundreds, if not thousands, of people.

□ 2130

We do not want to do anything to trip those people up on their way, because that is what makes America different: It is a land of opportunity. It is a land of economic freedom. When we tax two and three times and take that power of earnings away from people and cause families to lose that whole thrust, they may salvage the business, but for the next 5 to 10 years they are paying interest on this debt that they have accumulated to pay the taxes.

If we add up the money that is spent in this country avoiding this tax, I would not be surprised if this tax, what it costs people and businesses and what it costs the government to collect it, that it is an absolute loser. It is not time to tinker with it, it is time to get it out of the way as an impediment to growing successful businesses in this country. It is one less impediment for families and hard-working people.

Most people who own a business do not work 8 hours a day, they work double shift, triple shift, whatever it takes to make the business work, to pay the bills. Those people should not be threatened and have the problem of spending all their resources and time trying to salvage the family business.

It is time to put the death tax to bed. It is time to just remove it and get it out of the way as something that really is not in the best interests of our economic future.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

I also recognize on the floor right now a new addition to the Congress, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. AKIN), who has joined us this year. He also, I think, represents a good number of people who probably care very deeply about this issue.

He has come to this Congress I think intent, like many of us have, on making a change for the better to try and create an environment in this country where the American people get to keep more of what they earn, and where we are distributing power out of Washington, getting more power back into the economy and back into the hands of individuals and families and less in the hands of Washington bureaucrats.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. AKIN).

Mr. AKIN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

One of the things we could comment on here is the timeliness of this measure that is before us. One of the things we are aware of is that the economy has not been as strong as it might be. There is no coincidence that we are dealing with the repeal of the death tax.

I think people sometimes do not understand the connection, though. I think that the connection is rather straightforward when we consider where it is that people are employed in America. What we find is, and it is not intuitively obvious, I do not think, is that about 80 percent of our jobs are in small businesses. Those small businesses, many of them are started either by some individual or the parent of some individual.

Those small businesses, with the death tax the way it is now, stand at risk. Because if we take a lot of those businesses and all of a sudden we have to tax that asset at a 55 percent rate, we basically close the business down and send those jobs somewhere else. I do not think that is what we want to be doing with this economy.

Mr. Speaker, the whole point of getting rid of the death tax really has a lot to do with keeping jobs in this country and really helping, because if we take a look, all of our big corporations which we consider to be national assets, they all started at one time as a small business somewhere. So protecting those small businesses, allowing them to remain solvent, allowing those jobs to remain in this country and not closing down the family farm,

those are the kinds of things that affect our economy.

So this I would say, gentlemen, is a particularly timely measure, and it is well past due that we get rid of the tax on widows and orphans known as the death tax.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his comments.

I think just as a matter of fundamental tax policy and principle in this country, we have said this before and it is true, when a family member dies the family should not have to deal with the undertaker and the IRS at the same time. That is in effect what we have created with the Tax Code in this country.

As we again move into this debate tomorrow, we are going to hear a lot of arguments from the other side which will range in all kinds of ways. I cannot even envision, imagine, and contemplate at this point what we might hear in terms of opposition to this, but I can imagine a lot of it will center on the fact that this is going to help those who are particularly affluent and wealthy in this country.

The fact of the matter is they will use examples like Bill Gates and others. Those are people who have done well in this country. Yet, the people that I represent in the State of South Dakota are not the Bill Gateses, Steve Forbesees, Donald Trumps, they are hard-working American men and women who are trying to make ends meet, and who are trying to raise their kids and educate them, and create a better quality of life for themselves and their families and their communities.

Someone said earlier, I think the gentleman from Illinois when he was here on the floor, that only one in 20 farms is lost in this country or has to be sold to pay the death tax.

If we think about that, in my State of South Dakota there are 32,000, in round numbers, family farmers. If we lose one in 20, that is 5 percent. That is 1,600 farms.

Mr. Speaker, one does not have to be a real serious mathematician over time to look at what happens as far as a trend line. We will see in a very short order that what is the backbone of the economy in rural areas, and that is our family farmers, are very much at risk, very much imperiled, and very much in jeopardy if we do not take the steps that are necessary, not only to increase prices and to reduce the cost of production, two issues that are separate issues, but also to lessen the tax and regulatory burden on many of these people.

So again, I think this is a timely debate. I hope this is an issue that we will see broad bipartisan support for.

I am happen to yield to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. HAYWORTH).

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman, and welcome my friend, the gentleman from Missouri, to this Chamber and to service in the United States House.

My friends from Missouri often say, Show me. Sadly, the Federal government has taken a slogan that Hollywood popularized a few years ago, show me the money, and taken it from family enterprises.

It has been noted before, Mr. Speaker, that the power to tax is the power to destroy. Mr. Speaker, nowhere have we seen it with a more egregious impact, with a more unfair specter, with a fundamental departure from our values and ethics, than we have seen with this death tax.

Yes, for years it was called an estate tax, offering this type of placid, pastoral recognition. But what it is in reality is the death tax: the destroyer of jobs, the destroyer of economic opportunity, the destroyer of communities and a way of life.

Some have come to service on this Hill offering a slogan and a written word. It takes a village. Well, Mr. Speaker, I think it is fair to ask, what happens when we tax the businesses and farms and ranchers in said village literally to death? What happens when we abandon the notion of basic fairness and penalize people whose only offense is to succeed?

Why punish those who have worked to establish a growing business, an agricultural or economic enterprise creating jobs, generating wealth, and not coincidentally, Mr. Speaker, paying taxes on those funds even as they are accumulated? Why then turn around and tax the survivors, and destroy the businesses or drive them into arcane policies where time and money is drained from job creation in the conventional sense, instead to go to lawyers and accountants, and to drain the productivity of the economic enterprise?

Now, Mr. Speaker, we will have those who come to the floor, and we should acknowledge the fact, as my colleague from Illinois and now Missouri has done standing on that side of the aisle, there will be those who will join with us in a bipartisan way tomorrow, but there will be others who say, "Yes, this tax is unfair, but we cannot vote to do this now;" or, "not this way;" or maybe, "There is a cheaper way to do this," for political advantage or partisan embarrassment.

Mr. Speaker, I would simply say to the American people on the eve of this historic debate, accept no cheap substitutions. Join with us to put this death tax to death, because the power to tax has in this instance for too many families, for too many farms and ranches and small towns and essential businesses, become the destroyer of their worlds and their vision and their very livelihoods.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Arizona for stating in very eloquent and concise terms really what this debate is about, because on a fundamental level, inasmuch as we talk sometimes about these issues in abstract terms, this really is another issue, and we have

discussed many of them as we have talked about the President's agenda, that affects very real people in a very real and personal way.

As we move through trying to implement an agenda which, because of these good economic times and because of the hard work of the American people, has generated more money in the Federal Treasury than is necessary to run the cost of government, the American people I believe, and the President asked for it when he spoke right here behind us in this Chamber, the American people want and deserve a refund.

I think that if we look at the marriage penalty, which in my State affects 75,000 couples, if we talk about the per child tax credit which we acted on last week, which affects 119,000 children in South Dakota and their parents, it is about taking the dollars that are coming in here that are more than are necessary to run the cost of government, protecting and walling off Social Security, addressing the long-term needs to reform Medicare, paying down the Federal debt in historic levels, levels never before seen; certainly not seen in the last 40 years, when our colleagues on the other side ran this Chamber. I do not know when the last time is when we have had substantial paydown of the Federal debt.

But we have had an opportunity to allow the American people to keep some of this surplus which is theirs in the first place. The President has said it, it is the people's money. We need not forget that.

So whether it is the marriage penalty or the per child tax credit, the death tax, reducing marginal rates, it is important that the American people understand that they have overpaid the cost of government, very simply, very fundamentally. When that happens, just in the same way as when they go into the store to buy a pair of shoes and they hand the clerk a \$100 bill for an \$80 pair of shoes, they don't say, "Keep the change." They have overpaid the cost of the Federal government.

This is where the American people I think really need to be tuned into this debate, because it is their money we are talking about. We all know that if it stays here in Washington, it is going to get spent on more and bigger government programs.

It all comes back to the basic question, somebody talked about ideology earlier of who has the power: Does Washington, D.C. have the power, or does the American family have the power?

We happen to believe as a matter of principle that when we have an opportunity to allow the American people in this country to keep more of their hard-earned dollars, they have more power and more control of over their lives to make decisions that are in the best interests of themselves also and their families and their communities. That really is what this debate is all about.

Tomorrow is another chapter in that debate. We take up the death tax.

Again, I hope that we can successfully piece together a tax relief package that incorporates principles that not only provide tax relief, but tax reform and tax fairness to the American people.

The interesting thing about this is that our friends on the other side, they will complain and holler, but they are coming along. They have already agreed to more tax relief than this President vetoed last year when we acted upon it.

They are now rolling out alternatives, all kinds of alternatives. They may not like exactly the way we are doing it, but they understand what the American people understand. That is that this is their money, the Americans' money, and we need to make sure they are able to keep it.

I appreciate the gentleman from Arizona joining us this evening, and the gentleman from Missouri, for their thoughtful comments and observations. I expect the gentleman will be engaged in that debate tomorrow as it gets under way as a member of the Committee on Ways and Means. We thank the gentleman for his efforts to lead the charge to eliminate not only the death tax but a lot of the other inequities in the Tax Code.

I would say to the gentleman from Missouri, again, I appreciate the chance to conduct this discussion this evening. Hopefully we will get the debate under way. The debate is joined.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. BECERRA (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today and the balance of the week on account of personal business.

Mr. LATHAM (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for today and April 4 on account of the death of his father.

Mr. WALDEN of Oregon (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for today on account of attending a funeral.

Mr. WOLF (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for today on account of attending a funeral.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. DELAHUNT) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. LIPINSKI, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. HOYER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PALLONE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. LANGEVIN, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. MCKINNEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ALLEN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BACA, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. NORTON, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. KOLBE) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. OSBORNE, for 5 minutes, April 4.

Mr. BILIRAKIS, for 5 minutes, today and April 4.

Mr. GRUCCI, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. LINDER, for 5 minutes, April 4.

Mrs. MORELLA, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DUNCAN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. KELLER, for 5 minutes, April 4.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 44 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, April 4, 2001, at 10 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1415. A letter from the Regulatory Contact, Grain Inspection, Packers, and Stockyards Administration, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Fees for Commodity and Rice Inspection Services (RIN: 0580-AA74) received March 30, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1416. A letter from the Chief, Programs and Legislation Division, Office of Legislative Liaison, Department of the Air Force, transmitting notification that the Commander of Air Combat Command (ACC) is initiating a single-function cost comparison of the ACC Communications Group to include functions such as configuration and interoperability management, data-link, desktop software development, and Ground Tactical Air Control System at Langley Air Force Base, Virginia, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 2461; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1417. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement of Vice Admiral Joseph W. Mobley, United States Navy, and his advancement to the grade of Vice Admiral on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1418. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement of Vice Admiral Edward Moore, Jr., United States Navy, and his advancement to the grade of Vice Admiral on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1419. A letter from the Assistant to the Board, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, transmitting the Board's final rule—Equal Credit Opportunity [Regulation B; Docket No. R-1040] received March 30, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

1420. A letter from the Assistant to the Board, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, transmitting the Board's final rule—Truth in Savings [Regulation DD;

Docket No. R-1044] received March 30, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

1421. A letter from the Assistant to the Board, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, transmitting the Board's final rule—Consumer Leasing [Regulation M; Docket No. R-1042] received March 30, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

1422. A letter from the Assistant to the Board, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, transmitting the Board's final rule—Truth in Lending [Regulation Z; Docket No. R-1043] received March 30, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

1423. A letter from the Director, Office of Federal Housing Enterprise Oversight, Department of Housing and Urban Affairs, transmitting the Department's final rule—Assessments (RIN: 2550-AA15) received April 3, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

1424. A letter from the Director, Office of Federal Housing Enterprise Oversight, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting the Department's final rule—Rules of Practice and Procedure (RIN: 2550-AA16) received April 3, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

1425. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulations, Office of Public and Indian Housing, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting the Department's final rule—Allocation of Operating Subsidies Under the Operating Fund Formula [Docket No. FR-4425-I-12] (RIN: 2577-AB88) received April 2, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

1426. A letter from the Director, Office of Legislative Affairs, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's final rule—Rescission of Deposit Broker Notification, Recordkeeping and Reporting Requirements (RIN: 3064-AC48) received April 3, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

1427. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary for Mine Safety and Health, Department of Labor, transmitting the Department's final rule—Diesel Particulate Matter Exposure of Underground Coal Miners; Delay of Effective Dates (RIN: 1219-AA74) received March 30, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

1428. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary for Mine Safety and Health, Department of Labor, transmitting the Department's final rule—Diesel Particulate Matter Exposure of Underground Metal and Nonmetal Miners; Delay of Effective Dates (RIN: 1219-AB11) received March 30, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

1429. A letter from the Director, Corporate Policy and Research Department, Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's final rule—Benefits Payable in Terminated Single-Employer Plans; Allocation of Assets in Single-Employer Plans; Interest Assumptions for Valuing and Paying Benefits—received March 28, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

1430. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, FDA, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule—Medical Device; Exemption From Premarket Notification; Class II Devices; Pharmacy Compounding Systems [Docket No. 00P-1554] received April 2, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1431. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, transmitting notification concerning the Department of the Navy's proposed Letter(s) of Offer and Acceptance (LOA) to Australia for defense articles and services (Transmittal No. 01-04), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(b); to the Committee on International Relations.

1432. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the Department's report pursuant to title VIII of Public Law 101-246, the Foreign Relations Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1990-91, as amended; to the Committee on International Relations.

1433. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 13-597, "21st Century Financial Modernization Act of 2000" received April 03, 2001, pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

1434. A letter from the Chairman, Consumer Product Safety Commission, transmitting the Fiscal Year 2000 Annual Program Performance Report; to the Committee on Government Reform.

1435. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Policy, Management and Budget and Chief Financial Officer, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's Annual Accountability Report for Fiscal Year 2000; to the Committee on Government Reform.

1436. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Labor, transmitting an Annual Report on Performance and Accountability for FY 2000; to the Committee on Government Reform.

1437. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's FY 2000 Performance Report; to the Committee on Government Reform.

1438. A letter from the Executive Director, Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's Fiscal Year 2000 Annual Program Performance Report and the Fiscal Year 2002 Performance Plan; to the Committee on Government Reform.

1439. A letter from the Director, Office of Government Ethics, transmitting the Annual Program Performance Report for FY 2000; to the Committee on Government Reform.

1440. A letter from the Chair, Railroad Retirement Board, transmitting an Annual Program Performance Report for Fiscal Year 2000; to the Committee on Government Reform.

1441. A letter from the Acting Administrator, U.S. Agency for International Development, transmitting a report on FY 2000 Accountability; to the Committee on Government Reform.

1442. A letter from the Acting Director, Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule—Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Final Designation of Critical Habitat for the Arkansas River Basin Population of the Arkansas River Shiner (RIN: 1018-AG12) received March 30, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

1443. A letter from the Acting Assistant Administrator for Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Steller Sea Lion Protection Measures for the Groundfish Fisheries Off Alaska; Final 2001 Harvest Specifications and Associated Management Measures for the Groundfish Fisheries Off Alaska [Docket No. 010112012-1070-02; I.D. 011101B] (RIN: 0648-A082) received March 30, 2001, pursuant to 5

U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

1444. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pacific Cod by Catcher Vessels 60 Feet Length Overall and Longer Using Hook-and-Line Gear in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands [Docket No. 010112013-1013-01; I.D. 032601B] received March 30, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

1445. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Fisheries off West Coast States and in the Western Pacific; Coastal Pelagic Species Fisheries; Closure of Fishery for Pacific Mackerel [Docket No. 000831250-0250-01; 031901D] received April 3, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

1446. A letter from the General Counsel, Federal Emergency Management Agency, transmitting the Agency's "Major" final rule—Disaster Assistance; Cerro Grande Fire Assistance (RIN: 3067-AD12) received April 2, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1447. A letter from the Secretary, Judicial Conference of the United States, transmitting the Biennial Survey of Article III Judgeship Needs in the U.S. courts of appeals and the U.S. district courts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1448. A letter from the General Counsel, National Tropical Botanical Garden, transmitting the annual audit report of the National Tropical Botanical Garden, as of December 31, 2000 and 1999, pursuant to 36 U.S.C. 4610; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1449. A letter from the General Counsel, Federal Emergency Management Agency, transmitting the Agency's "Major" final rule—Assistance to Firefighters Grant Program (RIN: 3067-AD21) received April 2, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Science.

1450. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulations Management, Veterans Benefits Administration, Department of Veterans' Affairs, transmitting the Department's final rule—Claims Based on the Effects of Tobacco Products (RIN: 2900-AJ59) received April 3, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

1451. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulations Management, Veterans Benefits Administration, Department of Veterans' Affairs, transmitting the Department's final rule—Signature by Mark (RIN: 2900-AK07) received April 3, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

1452. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Action on Decision: Farmland Industries, Inc. v. Commissioner—received March 26, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

make permanent the favorable treatment of need-based educational aid under the anti-trust laws (Rept. 107-32). Referred to the Committee on the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HANSEN: Committee on Resources. H.R. 601. A bill to reauthorize the Chesapeake Bay Office of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 107-33). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HANSEN: Committee on Resources. H.R. 601. A bill to ensure the continued access of hunters to those Federal lands included within the boundaries of the Craters of the Moon National Monument in the State of Idaho pursuant to Presidential Proclamation 7373 of November 9, 2000, and to continue the applicability of the Taylor Grazing Act to the disposition of grazing fees arising from the use of such lands, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. 107-34). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HANSEN: Committee on Resources. H.R. 581. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture to use funds appropriated for wildland fire management in the Department of the Interior and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2001, to reimburse the United States Fish and Wildlife Service and the National Marine Fisheries Service to facilitate the interagency cooperation required under the Endangered Species Act of 1973 in connection with wildland fire management (Rept. 107-35). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HANSEN: Committee on Resources. H.R. 182. A bill to amend the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act to designate a segment of the Eight Mile River in the State of Connecticut for study for potential addition to the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. 107-36). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. THOMAS: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 8. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to phaseout the estate and gift taxes over a 10-year period, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 107-37). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. OXLEY: Committee on Financial Services. H.R. 974. A bill to increase the number of interaccount transfers which may be made from business accounts at depository institutions, to authorize the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System to pay interest on reserves, and for other purposes, with amendments (Rept. 107-38). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. REYNOLDS: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 111. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 8) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to phaseout the estate and gift taxes over a 10-year period, and for other purposes, (Rept. 107-39). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. FERGUSON (for himself, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. SCHROCK, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. QUINN, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Mr. PLATTS, Mrs. KELLY, Mr. SWEENEY, Mr. GILMAN, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mrs. ROUKEMA, Mr. GILCREST, Mr.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. SENSENBRENNER: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 768. A bill to amend the Improving America's Schools Act of 1994 to

OXLEY, Mr. GRUCCI, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. NEY, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. REYNOLDS, Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. WALSH, Mrs. BIGGERT, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. HINCHEY, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. OWENS, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. BALDACC, Mr. FRANK, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. EHLERS, Mr. SHERWOOD, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. LANTOS, and Mr. HOUGHTON):

H.R. 1330. A bill to amend the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act to fully fund 40 percent of the average per pupil expenditure for programs under part B of such Act; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. ARMEY (for himself, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. CANNON, Mr. FORD, Mr. BONILLA, Mr. BLAGOJEVICH, Mr. BALLENGER, Mrs. BONO, Mr. BUYER, Mr. CANTOR, Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. FOSSELLA, Mr. GILLMOR, Ms. HART, Mr. HOSTETTLER, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. KOLBE, Mr. MCHUGH, Ms. PRYCE of Ohio, Mr. REHBERG, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, and Mr. TANCREDO):

H.R. 1331. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow individuals a refundable credit against income tax for the purchase of private health insurance, and to establish State health insurance safety-net programs; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BERMAN (for himself and Mr. BOUCHER):

H.R. 1332. A bill to amend title 35, United States Code, to provide for improvements in the quality of patents on certain inventions; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BERMAN (for himself and Mr. BOUCHER):

H.R. 1333. A bill to amend title 35, United States Code, to provide for improvements in the quality of patents on certain inventions; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GILMAN (for himself, Mr. NADLER, and Mrs. MALONEY of New York):

H.R. 1334. A bill to convey certain Federal properties on Governors Island, New York; to the Committee on Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. ALLEN (for himself, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. BALDACC, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. HINCHEY, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. KUCINICH, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. OLVER, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. TIERNEY, and Ms. WOOLSEY):

H.R. 1335. A bill to reduce emissions of mercury, carbon dioxide, nitrogen oxides, and sulfur dioxide from fossil fuel-fired electric utility generating units operating in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Education and the Workforce, Financial Services, Transportation and Infrastructure, and

Science, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BAKER (for himself, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. VITTER, Mrs. THURMAN, Mr. TAUZIN, Mr. TANCREDO, Mr. MCCREERY, Mr. SHOWS, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. DELAY, and Mr. HERGER):

H.R. 1336. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend the period for filing for a credit or refund of individual income taxes to 7 years; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. MINK of Hawaii (for herself, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, and Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island):

H.R. 1337. A bill to amend the Native American Languages Act to provide for the support of Native American Language Survival Schools, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. BENTSEN:

H.R. 1338. A bill to provide for the designation of an Assistant Secretary of State for Victims of International Terrorism; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. BERRY:

H.R. 1339. A bill to provide market loss assistance during fiscal year 2001 to owners and producers on farms who are eligible for a final payment for fiscal year 2001 under production flexibility contracts entered into under the Agricultural Market Transition Act; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BILIRAKIS (for himself, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. UPTON, Mr. LANTOS, Ms. HART, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. BALDACC, and Ms. MCKINNEY):

H.R. 1340. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow taxpayers to designate that part or all of any income tax refund be paid over for use in biomedical research conducted through the National Institutes of Health; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. COLLINS:

H.R. 1341. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide capital gain treatment under section 631(b) of such Code for outright sales of timber by landowners; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COLLINS:

H.R. 1342. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 reduce individual capital gains rates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CONYERS (for himself, Mrs. MORELLA, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. FRANK, Mr. GEPHARDT, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. KOLBE, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. SHAYS, Mrs. KELLY, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. NADLER, Ms. LOFGREN, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. WEINER, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. BACA, Mr. BAIRD, Mr. BALDACC, Mr. BARRETT, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. BENTSEN, Ms. BERKLEY, Mrs. BIGGERT, Mr. BISHOP, Mr. BLAGOJEVICH, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. BORSKI, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mrs. CAPPES, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. CARDIN, Ms. CARSON of Indiana, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. CLAY, Mrs. CLAYTON, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. COYNE, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. DAVIS

of Illinois, Mr. DEFazio, Ms. DEGETTE, Ms. DELAURIO, Mr. DEUTSCH, Mr. DICKS, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. DOOLEY of California, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. EVANS, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. FARR of California, Mr. FILNER, Mr. FORD, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. FROST, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. GREENWOOD, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Ms. HARMAN, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. HILLIARD, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. HOFFFEL, Mr. HOLT, Mr. HONDA, Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon, Mr. HORN, Mr. HOYER, Mr. INSLEE, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Mr. KILDEE, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. KIND, Mr. KIRK, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. LAMPSON, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. LEACH, Ms. LEE, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. LUTHER, Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MATSUI, Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. MCKINNEY, Mr. McNULTY, Mrs. MEEK of Florida, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. MENENDEZ, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. MOORE, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Ms. NORTON, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. OLVER, Mr. OWENS, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Ms. PRYCE of Ohio, Mr. QUINN, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. REYES, Ms. RIVERS, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Mr. ROTHMAN, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. RUSH, Mr. SABO, Ms. SANCHEZ, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. SANDLIN, Mr. SAWYER, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. SIMMONS, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. SNYDER, Ms. SOLIS, Mr. STARK, Mr. STRICKLAND, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mrs. THURMAN, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Mr. UNDERWOOD, Ms. VELAZQUEZ, Mr. VISLOSKEY, Mr. WALSH, Mr. WAXMAN, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. WU, and Mr. WYNN):

H.R. 1343. A bill to provide Federal assistance to States and local jurisdictions to prosecute hate crimes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FRANK (for himself, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. NADLER, Mr. OLVER, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. STARK, and Ms. WOOLSEY):

H.R. 1344. A bill to provide for the medical use of marijuana in accordance with the laws of the various States; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. FRANK:

H.R. 1345. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to establish a Board of Visa Appeals within the Department of State to review decisions of consular officers concerning visa applications, revocations, and cancellations; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FRANK:

H.R. 1346. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to eliminate the prohibitions on

the transmission of abortion related matters, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GIBBONS (for himself and Ms. BERKLEY):

H.R. 1347. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 811 South Main Street in Yerington, Nevada, as the "Joseph E. Dini, Jr. Post Office"; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mr. HUTCHINSON (for himself and Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon):

H.R. 1348. A bill to provide funds to the National Center for Rural Law Enforcement, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ISAKSON:

H.R. 1349. A bill to repeal the 50 percent limitation on courses offered through telecommunications for student financial assistance programs; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Ms. SANCHEZ (for herself, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. BACA, Mr. BALDACCIO, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BENTSEN, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. BLAGOJEVICH, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. CAPUANO, Ms. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. DAVIS of Florida, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. DELAHUNT, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. DOOLEY of California, Mr. EVANS, Mr. FARR of California, Mr. FILNER, Mr. FRANK, Mr. FROST, Ms. HARMAN, Mr. HINCHAY, Ms. NORTON, Mr. HOLT, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. LANTOS, Mrs. LOWEY, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut, Mr. MATSUI, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. McGOVERN, Ms. MCKINNEY, Mr. MECHAN, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, Mr. NADLER, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. RIVERS, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Mr. SANDERS, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. SIMMONS, Ms. SOLIS, Mr. STARK, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mrs. THURMAN, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. TOWNS, Ms. VELAZQUEZ, Ms. WATERS, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. WEXLER, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. WYNN, and Mr. SHERMAN):

H.R. 1350. A bill to restore freedom of choice to women in the uniformed services serving outside the United States; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut (for herself, Mr. QUINN, Mr. FILNER, Mr. SIMMONS, Mr. SHOWS, Mr. HILLEARY, Mr. HILL, Mr. PETRI, Mr. LUTHER, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. HALL of Ohio, Mr. BARCIA, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. OLIVER, Mr. HORN, Mr. STRICKLAND, Mr. BARR of Georgia, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. FOSSELLA, Mrs. MEEK of Florida, Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois, Mr. MASCARA, Mr. BOEHLERT, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. DAVIS of Florida, Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. LAMPSON, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. CAMP, Mr. BALDACCIO, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut, Mr. WYNN, Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon, Mr. FRANK, Mr. FALBOMAVAEGA, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. COYNE, Ms. MCKINNEY, Ms. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mrs. THURMAN, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. McNULTY, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. PAYNE, and Mr. DEAL of Georgia):

H.R. 1351. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for Government fur-

nished headstones or markers for the marked graves of veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. JONES of North Carolina:

H.R. 1352. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to codify and make modifications to certain provisions relating to "Buy American" requirements; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota:

H.R. 1353. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act and titles XVIII and XIX of the Social Security Act to sustain access to vital emergency medical services in rural areas; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. KING (for himself, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. WEINER, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. BLAGOJEVICH, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mrs. MYRICK, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. SHOWS, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. ANDREWS, Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon, Mr. NADLER, Mrs. ROUKEMA, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mrs. THURMAN, Mr. McNULTY, and Mrs. KELLY):

H.R. 1354. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide enhanced reimbursement for, and expanded capacity to, mammography services under the Medicare Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. LAFALCE (for himself and Ms. WATERS):

H.R. 1355. A bill to merge the deposit insurance funds at the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mrs. LOWEY:

H.R. 1356. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to require that foods containing spices, flavoring, or coloring derived from meat, poultry, other animal products (including insects), or known allergens bear labeling stating that fact and their names; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. McCRERY (for himself, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. CAMP, Mr. CRANE, Ms. DUNN, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. HAYWORTH, Mr. HERGER, Mr. HOUGHTON, Mr. HULSHOF, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. McNULTY, Mr. POMEROY, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin, Mr. SHAW, Mr. TANNER, Mr. WATKINS, and Mr. WELLER):

H.R. 1357. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permanently extend the subpart F exemption for active financing income; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McDERMOTT (for himself and Mr. ROYCE):

H.R. 1358. A bill to remove the sanctions imposed on India and Pakistan as a result of the detonation by those countries of nuclear explosive devices in 1998, and for other purposes; to the Committee on International Relations, and in addition to the Committee on Financial Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provi-

sions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. McNULTY:

H.R. 1359. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to expand and extend the ability of certain exempt organizations to avoid recognizing a gain on the sale of property used directly in the performance of an exempt function; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California (for himself, Mr. KING, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Ms. LEE, Ms. SLAUGHTER, and Mr. QUINN):

H.R. 1360. A bill to ensure project labor agreements are permitted in certain circumstances; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. NETHERCUTT (for himself, Mr. LAFALCE, and Mrs. CAPPS):

H.R. 1361. A bill to provide for coverage of all medically necessary pancreas transplantation procedures under the Medicare Program; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. NORTON (for herself and Mr. ABERCROMBIE):

H.R. 1362. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to prohibit discrimination in the payment of wages on account of sex, race, or national origin, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. OTTER (for himself, Mr. HANSEN, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. MICA, Mr. RADANOVICH, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. BASS, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. CANNON, Mr. NETHERCUTT, Mr. McINNIS, Mr. SCHAFER, Mr. COOKSEY, Mr. HEFLEY, Mr. HERGER, Mr. STUMP, Mr. GILCHREST, Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. HAYES, Mr. WALDEN of Oregon, Mr. REBERG, Mr. FLAKE, and Mr. BOSWELL):

H.R. 1363. A bill to help ensure general aviation aircraft access to Federal land and to the airspace over that land; to the Committee on Resources, and in addition to the Committees on Agriculture, and Transportation and Infrastructure, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. PAUL:

H.R. 1364. A bill to restore to taxpayers awareness of the true cost of government by eliminating the withholding of income taxes by employers and requiring individuals to pay income taxes in monthly installments, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. ROUKEMA (for herself, Mr. FLETCHER, Mr. WU, Mr. CALLAHAN, Mr. GILMAN, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. CONYERS, and Mr. BOEHLERT):

H.R. 1365. A bill to amend title III of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to provide for digital education partnerships; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Ms. SANCHEZ (for herself, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. CONDIT, Mr. FARR of California, Mr. BACA, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. COX, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. FILNER, Ms. SOLIS, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. MATSUI, and Mr. HONDA):

H.R. 1366. A bill to designate the United States Post Office building located at 3101 West Sunflower Avenue in Santa Ana, California, as the "Hector G. Godinez Post Office

Building"; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mr. SAXTON (for himself and Mr. SIMMONS):

H.R. 1367. A bill to provide for the conservation and rebuilding of overfished stocks of Atlantic highly migratory species of fish, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. SAXTON:

H.R. 1368. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to remove the requirement of a mandatory beginning date for distributions from individual retirement plans; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SCHIFF (for himself, Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. MOORE, Mr. HILL, Mr. JOHN, Mr. BOYD, Ms. HARMAN, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. TURNER, Mr. ROSS, Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi, and Mr. BISHOP):

H.R. 1369. A bill to amend the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 to require a three-fifths majority vote in the House of Representatives or Senate to waive the point of order against considering spending or revenue legislation for a fiscal year before a concurrent resolution on the budget is in place for that fiscal year, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. SOUDER:

H.R. 1370. A bill to amend the National Wildlife Refuge System Administration Act of 1966 to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to provide for maintenance and repair of buildings and properties located on lands in the National Wildlife Refuge System by lessees of such facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. STARK (for himself, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. FILNER, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. FRANK, Ms. SOLIS, Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Mr. CONYERS, and Ms. CARSON of Indiana):

H.R. 1371. A bill to provide for grants to State child welfare systems to improve quality standards and outcomes, and to authorize the forgiveness of loans made to certain students who become child welfare workers; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. STEARNS:

H.R. 1372. A bill to prohibit the expenditure of Federal funds to conduct or support research on the cloning of humans, and to express the sense of the Congress that other countries should establish substantially equivalent restrictions; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Science, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. STUPAK:

H.R. 1373. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 310 South State Street in St. Ignace, Michigan, as the "Robert W. Davis Post Office Building"; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mr. STUPAK:

H.R. 1374. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 600 Calumet Street in Lake Linden, Michigan, as the "Philip E. Ruppe Post Office Building"; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mr. STUPAK (for himself, Mr. WATKINS, Mr. FROST, Mr. PAUL, Mr.

COSTELLO, Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. FARR of California, and Mr. OSBORNE):

H.R. 1375. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to adjust the labor costs relating to items and services furnished in a geographically reclassified hospital for which reimbursement under the Medicare Program is provided on a prospective basis; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. THOMPSON of California (for himself, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. FARR of California, Mr. OSE, Mr. RADANOVICH, and Mr. DOOLEY of California):

H.R. 1376. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide that transfers of family-owned business interests shall be exempt from estate taxation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. THORNBERRY (for himself, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, and Mrs. TAUSCHER):

H.R. 1377. A bill to ensure that military personnel do not lose the right to cast votes in elections in their domicile as a result of their service away from the domicile, to amend the Uniformed and Overseas Citizens Absentee Voting Act to extend the voter registration and absentee ballot protections for absent uniformed services personnel under such Act to State and local elections, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration, and in addition to the Committees on Veterans' Affairs, the Judiciary, and Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. TRAFICANT:

H.R. 1378. A bill to authorize grants for certain water and waste disposal facility projects in rural areas; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. UDALL of Colorado:

H.R. 1379. A bill to provide for a study of options for protecting the open space characteristics of certain lands in and adjacent to the Arapaho and Roosevelt National Forests in Colorado, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. UDALL of Colorado (for himself and Ms. DEGETTE):

H.R. 1380. A bill to designate as wilderness certain lands within the Rocky Mountain National Park in the State of Colorado; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. UDALL of Colorado:

H.R. 1381. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to establish the Cooperative Landscape Conservation Program; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. UDALL of Colorado:

H.R. 1382. A bill to authorize increased fines for improper use of vehicles that results in damage to public lands or national forests, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources, and in addition to the Committees on Agriculture, and the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. UDALL of New Mexico (for himself, Mr. HAYWORTH, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma, Mr. CAMP, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Ms. DELAURO, and Mr. BROWN of Ohio):

H.R. 1383. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to clarify that Indian women with breast or cervical cancer who are eligible for health services provided under a medical care program of the Indian Health Service or of a tribal organization are included in the optional Medicaid eligibility category of breast or cervical cancer patients added by the Breast and Cervical Cancer Prevention and Treatment Act of 2000; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. UDALL of New Mexico (for himself and Mr. CANNON):

H.R. 1384. A bill to amend the National Trails System Act to designate the Navajo Long Walk to Bosque Redondo as a national historic trail; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. OXLEY:

H. Con. Res. 93. Concurrent resolution providing for a conditional adjournment of the House of Representatives and a conditional recess or adjournment of the Senate.

By Mr. ABERCROMBIE (for himself,

Mrs. MORELLA, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. BALDACCIO, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. FILNER, Mr. HONDA, Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri, Mr. McNULTY, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, Ms. NORTON, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Mr. SANDERS, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Ms. SOLIS, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. WYNN, Mr. PASSTOR, Mr. BACA, Ms. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. LANTOS, and Mr. GUTIERREZ):

H. Con. Res. 94. Concurrent resolution recognizing the significance of Equal Pay Day to demonstrate the disparity between wages paid to men and women; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mr. TANCREDO:

H. Con. Res. 95. Concurrent resolution supporting a National Charter Schools Week; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. TRAFICANT:

H. Con. Res. 96. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the People's Republic of China should release immediately the crew members of the United States Navy EP-3E Aries II reconnaissance aircraft that made an emergency landing on the Chinese island of Hainan on April 1, 2001, and should release immediately and intact that aircraft in accordance with international law; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. BERMAN (for himself and Mr. BOUCHER):

H. Res. 110. A resolution providing that it shall not be in order in the House of Representatives to consider certain funding measures for the United States Patent and Trademark Office; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. FOLEY (for himself, Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. SIMMONS, Mr. KOLBE, Mr. SWEENEY, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. KELLER, Mrs. THURMAN, Mr. SHERWOOD, Mr. MOORE, Ms. HART, Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia, Mrs. WILSON, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, Mr. THUNE, and Mr. BUYER):

H. Res. 112. A resolution recognizing the upcoming 100th anniversary of the 4-H Youth Development Program and commending such program for service to the youth of the world; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. MCKEON:

H. Res. 113. A resolution urging the House of Representatives to support events such as the "Increase the Peace Day"; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

14. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Maine, relative to Resolution H.P. 958 memorializing the United States Congress to either provide 40% of the national average per pupil expenditure to assist states and local education agencies with the excess costs of educating children with disabilities or amend the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act to

allow states more flexibility in implementing its mandates; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XII, private bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas:

H.R. 1385. A bill for the relief of Gao Zhan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROTHMAN:

H.R. 1386. A bill for the relief of Alexandre Malofienko, Olga Matsko, and their son, Vladimir Malofienko; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 8: Mr. THOMAS and Mr. HASTERT.
H.R. 10: Mr. GEKAS, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. DOOLITTLE, and Ms. CARSON of Indiana.

H.R. 17: Mr. OSBORNE and Mr. BOSWELL.
H.R. 21: Mr. CLEMENT and Mr. WAMP.
H.R. 25: Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, Mr. SIMMONS, and Ms. SLAUGHTER.

H.R. 28: Mr. HULSHOF, Mrs. WILSON, and Mr. WEXLER.

H.R. 31: Mr. SPENCE.

H.R. 51: Mr. MCINTYRE, Mrs. BIGGERT, and Ms. SANCHEZ.

H.R. 61: Mr. PETRI.
H.R. 126: Mr. BONIOR and Mr. KUCINICH.
H.R. 128: Mr. BONIOR, Ms. LEE, and Mr. NADLER.

H.R. 134: Mr. FOLEY.
H.R. 144: Mr. GONZALEZ.
H.R. 162: Mr. LAFALCE, Ms. SOLIS, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. DOYLE, and Ms. SLAUGHTER.

H.R. 168: Mr. GILLMOR and Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia.

H.R. 179: Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mrs. BIGGERT, Mr. UNDERWOOD, Mr. HAYES, and Ms. SANCHEZ.

H.R. 183: Mr. PALLONE.

H.R. 184: Mr. TOWNS.

H.R. 214: Mr. BALLENGER and Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota.

H.R. 236: Mr. FERGUSON, Ms. SOLIS, Mr. GIBBONS, and Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky.

H.R. 280: Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina, Mrs. BONO, Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi, Mr. NORWOOD, Mr. RILEY, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. WATKINS, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mr. SPENCE, and Mr. PETRI.

H.R. 281: Ms. HART, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. CRAMER, and Mr. RUSH.

H.R. 285: Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. NADLER, Mr. CAPUANO, and Mr. GUTIERREZ.

H.R. 288: Mrs. BIGGERT.

H.R. 290: Mr. FOLEY.

H.R. 298: Mr. CRANE and Mr. PLATTS.

H.R. 303: Mr. SCOTT and Mr. CLAY.

H.R. 320: Mr. FOLEY.

H.R. 326: Mr. LANGEVIN and Mr. SHERMAN.

H.R. 336: Mr. ENGLISH and Mr. RUSH.

H.R. 340: Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. FRANK, and Mrs. JONES of Ohio.

H.R. 347: Mr. CLEMENT.

H.R. 356: Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri.

H.R. 374: Mr. HEFLEY and Mr. ISSA.

H.R. 380: Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas and Mr. KILDEE.

H.R. 382: Mr. GOODE.

H.R. 385: Mr. CALVERT.

H.R. 394: Mr. STUPAK, Mr. GILLMOR, Mr. BARR of Georgia, Mr. MORAN of Kansas, Mr.

PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. FROST, Mr. HANSEN, Mr. DICKS, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MCINTYRE, and Mr. PLATTS.

H.R. 396: Mr. BARR of Georgia, Mr. WOLF, Mrs. CAPITO, and Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota.

H.R. 400: Mr. GRUCCI, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. PHELPS, Mr. RYUN of Kansas, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. BLAGOJEVICH, Mr. RUSH, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mrs. CUBIN, Mr. BUYER, and Mr. OSE.

H.R. 432: Mr. KUCINICH and Ms. KAPTUR.

H.R. 433: Mr. KUCINICH and Ms. KAPTUR.

H.R. 458: Ms. HART.

H.R. 466: Ms. SLAUGHTER.

H.R. 475: Mr. SIMMONS and Mr. SCHROCK.

H.R. 476: Mr. ENGLISH and Mr. BARTON of Texas.

H.R. 478: Mr. HINCHEY.

H.R. 482: Mr. CANTOR, Mr. PENCE, Mr. HILLARY, and Mr. HAYES.

H.R. 499: Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. LANTOS, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. EVANS, Ms. SOLIS, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. NADLER, Mr. GUTIERREZ and Mr. WEXLER.

H.R. 500: Mr. RUSH and Mr. RANGEL.

H.R. 512: Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. OLVER, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. BLAGOJEVICH, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, and Mr. LAHOOD.

H.R. 513: Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. OLVER, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. SHOWS, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. KLECZKA, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Ms. HART, and Ms. VELAZQUEZ.

H.R. 514: Mr. FOLEY.

H.R. 521: Mr. FRANK.

H.R. 525: Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island and Mr. GRAHAM.

H.R. 527: Mr. FOLEY, Mr. SHAW, and Ms. HART.

H.R. 537: Mr. ROYCE, Mrs. BIGGERT, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, and Mr. PASCRELL.

H.R. 544: Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. NADLER, and Ms. SLAUGHTER.

H.R. 548: Mrs. ROUKEMA, Mr. MICA, Mr. BALDACCIO, and Mr. SKEEN.

H.R. 571: Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Ms. CARSON of Indiana, and Ms. MCKINNEY.

H.R. 572: Mr. KING, Mr. McNULTY, Mrs. KELLY, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. COYNE, Mr. HYDE, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. CLEMENT, Ms. CARSON of Indiana, and Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon.

H.R. 577: Mr. CLEMENT.

H.R. 579: Mr. GUTIERREZ.

H.R. 596: Mr. MATSUI.

H.R. 599: Mr. LAFALCE, Ms. SOLIS, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. DELAHUNT, Ms. CARSON of Indiana, and Mr. RUSH.

H.R. 602: Mr. CLAY, Mr. GORDON, and Mr. HONDA.

H.R. 606: Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. DAVIS of Florida, and Mr. RANGEL.

H.R. 611: Mr. BENTSEN, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Ms. SOLIS, Mr. BALDACCIO, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. PENCE, Mr. DELAHUNT, and Mr. PETRI.

H.R. 612: Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, and Mr. BORSKI.

H.R. 619: Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. CONYERS, and Mr. POMEROY.

H.R. 630: Mr. SKELTON.

H.R. 634: Mrs. BIGGERT, Mr. COX, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin, and Mr. BASS.

H.R. 638: Mr. ENGEL.

H.R. 659: Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. DEFazio, Ms. DELAURO, and Ms. BALDWIN.

H.R. 662: Mr. BUYER, Mr. BONILLA, Mr. COMBEST, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. WYNN, Mr. MOORE, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. DEAL of Georgia, Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. MCCRERY, Mr. HERGER, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. RYUN of Kansas, Mr. BALDACCIO, Mr. UPTON, Mr. BOYD, Ms. HART, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois, Mr. WATKINS, Mr. SCARBOROUGH, and Mr. TRAFICANT.

H.R. 663: Mr. WYNN, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. FILNER, and Mr. REYES.

H.R. 664: Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Ms. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. MOORE, Mr. HILL, Mr. FLETCHER, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. LUCAS of Oklahoma, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Mr. OWENS, and Mr. ISRAEL.

H.R. 665: Mr. CARSON of Oklahoma.

H.R. 672: Mr. FARR of California.

H.R. 683: Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas and Mr. HONDA.

H.R. 686: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. KIND, Mr. CLEMENT, Mr. BALDACCIO, and Mrs. JONES of Ohio.

H.R. 687: Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. BALDACCIO, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Mr. CAPUANO.

H.R. 696: Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. McNULTY, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. FRANK, Mr. PAYNE, and Mr. FILNER.

H.R. 699: Ms. WOOLSEY.

H.R. 717: Ms. DELAURO, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. BONILLA, Mr. TERRY, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. CARSON of Oklahoma, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Mr. SWEENEY.

H.R. 737: Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. SHIMKUS, and Mr. SANDLIN.

H.R. 770: Mr. HONDA.

H.R. 774: Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut and Mr. LAHOOD.

H.R. 776: Mr. LAHOOD.

H.R. 777: Mr. LAHOOD.

H.R. 781: Mr. STARK, Mr. SABO, Ms. HARMAN, Mr. OBERSTAR, and Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.

H.R. 782: Mr. FROST.

H.R. 786: Ms. MCKINNEY.

H.R. 790: Mrs. MALONEY of New York.

H.R. 804: Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky.

H.R. 808: Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. GILLMOR, Mr. ROTHMAN, Mr. JENKINS, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. GREENWOOD, Mr. WU, Mr. REYES, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. GILCHREST, and Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut.

H.R. 817: Mr. GOODE.

H.R. 818: Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania, Mr. WEXLER, and Mr. MCCARTHY of Missouri.

H.R. 822: Ms. WOOLSEY.

H.R. 823: Mr. CUNNINGHAM.

H.R. 826: Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky.

H.R. 827: Mr. OSE, Mr. PASCRELL, and Mr. MENENDEZ.

H.R. 870: Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. CLAY, and Ms. SANCHEZ.

H.R. 876: Mr. BOUCHER and Mr. THORNBERRY.

H.R. 883: Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. DELAY, Mr. SHOWS, Mr. HILLEARY, Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin, Mr. OTTER, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. STUMP, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. HUTCHINSON, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. STEARNS, Ms. EMERSON, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. BERRY, Mr. SKEEN, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. NETHERCUTT, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. SCHAFFER, Mr. BUYER, Mr. AKIN, Mr. REHBERG, Mr. TANCREDO, and Mr. DUNCAN.

H.R. 899: Mr. SHIMKUS.

H.R. 907: Mr. LARSON of Connecticut.

H.R. 909: Mr. POMEROY.

H.R. 911: Mr. LANTOS and Mr. MATSUI.

H.R. 912: Mr. SOUDER, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. CRANE, Mr. LEVIN, and Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 913: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.

H.R. 914: Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas.

H.R. 917: Ms. ESHOO.

H.R. 919: Mr. MCGOVERN and Ms. HART.

H.R. 949: Mr. KOLBE, Ms. HART, and Mr. HASTINGS of Washington.

H.R. 951: Mr. BERETER, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri, Mr. GOODE, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. CLAY, Mr. OSBORNE, and Mr. HINCHEY.

H.R. 959: Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. GONZALEZ, and Mr. DEFazio.

H.R. 969: Mr. BROWN of South Carolina, Mr. PLATTS, Mr. HYDE, and Mr. WELDON of Florida.

H.R. 974: Mr. SHERMAN.
 H.R. 993: Mr. HYDE.
 H.R. 1004: Ms. BROWN of Florida.
 H.R. 1008: Mr. OSE, Mr. LATHAM, and Mr. SOUDER.
 H.R. 1014: Mr. MOORE, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Ms. NORTON, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. FILNER, Mr. EVANS, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, and Ms. BROWN of Florida.
 H.R. 1016: Mr. TRAFICANT and Mr. SHOWS.
 H.R. 1019: Mr. GUTKNECHT, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. SESSIONS, Mrs. MYRICK, and Mr. SPENCE.
 H.R. 1024: Mr. CRANE, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. SHAW, Mr. PETRI, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. ENGLISH, and Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.
 H.R. 1051: Ms. CARSON of Indiana, and Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.
 H.R. 1052: Mr. DINGELL, Mr. ISRAEL, and Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.
 H.R. 1053: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.
 H.R. 1054: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.
 H.R. 1055: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.
 H.R. 1056: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.
 H.R. 1057: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.
 H.R. 1058: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.
 H.R. 1059: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.
 H.R. 1060: Mr. FRANK, Mr. LANTOS, and Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.
 H.R. 1061: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.
 H.R. 1072: Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Ms. NORTON, Mr. BALDACCIO, and Mr. PAUL.
 H.R. 1073: Mr. ROTHMAN, Mr. HILL, Mr. MATSUI, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. KANJORSKI, Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon, Ms. LEE, Mr. McNULTY, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. BACA, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. GORDON, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. HILLIARD, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. HOLT, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. MENENDEZ, Ms. NORTON, Mrs. ROUKEMA, Mr. SANDERS, Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut, Mr. DICKS, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. OWENS, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri, Mr. BAIRD, Mr. GOODE, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. WELLER, Mr. STRICKLAND, Mr. WYNN, and Mr. CAPUANO.
 H.R. 1075: Mr. CONDIT.
 H.R. 1078: Mr. OBERSTAR.
 H.R. 1082: Mr. BARCIA, Mr. GUTKNECHT, Mr. CLEMENT, and Mr. SANCHEZ.

H.R. 1086: Mr. BLAGOJEVICH.
 H.R. 1088: Mr. LATOURETTE.
 H.R. 1089: Mr. LATOURETTE and Mr. RUSH.
 H.R. 1100: Mr. HOSTETTLER.
 H.R. 1117: Mr. BLAGOJEVICH, Mr. SIMMONS, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. HONDA, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, and Mr. DELAHUNT.
 H.R. 1119: Mr. MCGOVERN.
 H.R. 1127: Mr. SESSIONS.
 H.R. 1129: Mr. MCGOVERN and Mr. CLEMENT.
 H.R. 1130: Mr. MCGOVERN and Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California.
 H.R. 1135: Mr. CLEMENT and Mr. PICKERING.
 H.R. 1136: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois and Mr. CLEMENT.
 H.R. 1137: Mr. HINCHEY and Mr. FROST.
 H.R. 1144: Mr. RUSH.
 H.R. 1150: Mr. PICKERING.
 H.R. 1155: Mr. CAMP, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Ms. PRYCE of Ohio, Mr. THURMAN, Mr. BAIRD, Ms. BERKLEY, and Mr. SCHIFF.
 H.R. 1162: Mr. DEFazio, Mr. SERRANO, and Mr. FATTAH.
 H.R. 1170: Mr. LANTOS, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. NADLER, and Mr. UNDERWOOD.
 H.R. 1180: Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. ROYBAL-AL-LARD, Mr. HAYWORTH, and Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.
 H.R. 1195: Mr. GUTIERREZ and Mr. KING.
 H.R. 1203: Mr. NETHERCUTT and Mr. OTTER.
 H.R. 1227: Mr. ENGLISH.
 H.R. 1230: Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Ms. RIVERS, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. CONYERS, and Mr. RANGEL.
 H.R. 1234: Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. CLAY, and Mrs. MEEK of Florida.
 H.R. 1238: Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. FOLEY, and Ms. NORTON.
 H.R. 1242: Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN.
 H.R. 1252: Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. REYES, Ms. WOOLSEY, Ms. KILPATRICK, Ms. VELAZQUEZ, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. CONYERS, and Mr. RUSH.
 H.R. 1271: Mr. BURR of North Carolina, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mrs. NORTHUP, Mr. VITTER, and Ms. BERKLEY.
 H.R. 1274: Mr. WAMP.
 H.R. 1280: Mr. CRANE, Ms. MCKINNEY, Mr. FROST, and Mr. BORSKI.
 H.R. 1291: Mr. ROGERS of Michigan and Mr. SKELTON.
 H.R. 1300: Mrs. MEEK of Florida and Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.
 H.R. 1306: Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. GONZALEZ, Ms. DELAULO, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. CLAY, and Mr. RUSH.

H.R. 1307: Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. WOLF and Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.
 H.R. 1308: Mr. HASTERT, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. DOOLITTLE, and Mr. SESSIONS.
 H.R. 1311: Mr. FRANK.
 H.R. 1323: Mr. RANGEL, Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, Mr. UNDERWOOD, and Mrs. NAPOLITANO.
 H.J. Res. 15: Mr. RAHALL and Mr. LEACH.
 H.J. Res. 20: Mr. RYUN of Kansas and Mr. BARTON of Texas.
 H.J. Res. 36: Mr. GEKAS, Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. GRAVES, Mr. LINDER, and Mr. TIBERI.
 H.J. Res. 40: Mr. KOLBE.
 H. Con. Res. 17: Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Ms. DELAULO, Mr. KOLBE, Mr. BENTSEN and Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut.
 H. Con. Res. 26: Mr. FRANK.
 H. Con. Res. 42: Mr. PASCRELL and Mr. LEVIN.
 H. Con. Res. 58: Mr. HORN.
 H. Con. Res. 59: Mrs. ROUKEMA, and Mr. BILIRAKIS.
 H. Con. Res. 72: Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. HART, and Mr. PICKERING.
 H. Con. Res. 89: Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon, Mr. SIMPSON, and Mr. ROHRBACHER.
 H. Res. 56: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. DEFazio, Ms. DELAULO, Mrs. LOWEY and Mr. PAYNE.
 H. Res. 91: Mr. HOEFFEL.
 H. Res. 97: Mr. BORSKI, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. OLVER, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mrs. BIGGERT, Ms. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. KLECZKA, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. BARRETT, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. FILNER, Ms. VELAZQUEZ, and Ms. DELAULO.
 H. Res. 109: Mr. EVANS, Mr. RANGEL, and Mr. SPRATT.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 933: Mr. TOWNS.
 H.R. 1193: Mr. DOOLITTLE.